This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600004961Z

110.

Published by

WILLIAM SKEFFINGTON, 163, PICCADILLY.

Cheap Edition (the Fifteenth), price 1s., bound in vellum cloth.

The Sinfulness of Little Sins. By JOHN JACKSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Lincoln. I. The Exceeding Sinfulness of Sin. II. Sins of the Temper. III. Sins of Pride and Vanity. IV. Sins of the Thoughts. V. Sins of the Tongue. VI. Sins of Omission. Adapted for general distribution.

"Very neatly printed; well suited for distribution."—Guardian.

"A very neat and cheap edition, forming a very suitable present to all classes of persons, from the palace to the cottage."—English Churchman.

"All may peruse this book with profit."—Church Review.

By the same Author.

The Witness of the Spirit: Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. Fcap. 8vo.

Repentance: its Necessity, Nature, and Aids. Contents.—I. The Necessity of Repentance. II. The Nature of Repentance. III. The Properties of True Repentance. IV. The Aids of Penitence. V. The Aids of Penitence (continued). VI. The Pardon of Penitence. Sixth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

The Spirit of the World, and the Spirit which is of God. A Sermon addressed to the Newly-confirmed, and preparatory to the Holy Communion. Fifth Edition. Beautifully printed on toned paper, for distribution. Price 6d.

The Church's Missions; Her Failure and Her Hope. A Sermon preached in Lincoln Cathedral, January 29, 1863, at the Farewell Service of the Central African Mission. Price 6d.

Elijah. A Course of Lectures preached in the Parish Church of St. James's, Westminster, on the Fridays in Lent. A.D. 1862. By John Edward Kempe, M.A., Rector of S. James's. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Plain Sermons. By the Rev. J. G. COWAN, Incumbent of S. John's, Hammersmith, including Sermons for Advent, Lent, Easter, etc., etc. Third Series Fcap., cloth, 5s.

Published by William Skeffington, 163, Piccadilly.

The Future of the Human Race. By ALFRED BOWEN EVANS, D.D., Rector of St. Mary-le-Stand. I. The Orders of the Saved. II. The Saved Nations. III. The Binding of Satan. IV. The Judgment Books. Cloth, price 1s. 6d.

By the same Author.

Life's Traveller arrested on his Journey, a Sermon delivered in the church of S. Andrews, Wells-street, occasioned by the decease of the Rev. JAMES MURRAY, the Incumbent. Second edition, 8vo., 1s.

Weariness in Work: A Discourse, delivered in the Church of S. Mary-le-Strand, before the Members of the English Church Union, at their Third Anniversary, June 18, 1862. Price 6d.

Hints to District Visitors, followed by a Few Prayers selected for their Use. By FRANCIS HESSEY, D.C.L., Incumbent of S. Barnabas, Kensington. Fourth Edition, cloth, 6d.

By the Same Author.

Confirmation Questions in Six Papers, for the use of the Parochial Clergy in preparing candidates for Confirmation and First Communion. Sixth edition, price 2d.

Hymns for the Church or Home Circle. Composed and Arranged by W. R. BRAINE. Containing Keble's Morning and Evening Hymns; also Hymns for Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Easter, and all the Christian Seasons. Third edition, imp. 8vo, complete work, cloth, 5s.; or in 6 parts, 1s. each.

Gleams on the Font. A Selection of Hymns and Poems, illustrating the Services of Baptism and Confirmation. From Keble, Herbert, Longfellow, Lyra Innocentium, &c., with a Photograph of Thorwaldsen's Font in Copenhagen Cathedral. Cloth antique, price 5s. 6d.

Instruction Preparatory to the Holy Communion, in Six Sermons, by the Rev. HENRY SWABEY, M.A., Curate of S. Martin-in-the Fields. Fcp. cloth. 2s.

The Voice of the Last Prophet. A Practical Interpretation of the Apocalypse. By the Rev. Edward Huntingford, D.C.L., late Fellow of New College, Oxford. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, 7s.

By the Same Author.

The Schoolboy's Way of Eternal Life. His Religious Motives, Trials, and Duties. Fcp. cloth. 3s. 6d.

A Practical Treatise on Evil Thoughts: wherein their Nature, Origin, &c., are Considered; with Rules for their Restraint and Suppression. By WILLIAM CHILCOT, M.A. New Edition, 2s. 6d.

"It is brimful of poetical feeling, of deep philosophy, and of imperishable truth."—CHURCH AND STATE GAZETTE.

THE

Mosaic Origin

OF THE

PENTATEUCH CONSIDERED

IN CONNECTION WITH

PARTS II. & III. OF BP. COLENSO'S 'CRITICAL EXAMINATION.'

BY A

LAYMAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

AUTHOR OF 'THE HISTORIC CHARACTER OF THE PENTATEUCH VINDICATED.'

'Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, the statutes and judgments.'—MAL.,iv.4.

'It is an admitted rule of all sound criticism, that books are to be regarded as proceeding from the writers whose names they bear, unless very strong reasons indeed can be adduced to the contrary.'—RAWLINSON'S BAMPTON LECT.,p.30.

LONDON:

WILLIAM SKEFFINGTON, 163, PICCADILLY.

1864.

100. f. 110.

LONDON :
P. SHOBERL, PRINTER, 37, DEAN STREET, SOHO.

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE AND MOST REVEREND

WILLIAM THOMSON, D.D.

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

THIS BOOK IS

(BY PERMISSION)

DEDICATED

AS A TOKEN OF

GRATEFUL RESPECT AND ESTEEM.

London, 1864.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	v—xvii
AUTHORITIES REFERRED TO	xviii
CHAP. I.—EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOUR OF THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH	1—5
CHAP. II.—SIGNS OF COMPILATION IN THE EARLIER BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH	6—39
CHAP. III.—THE PROPER NAMES IN THE PENTATEUCH AND HISTORICAL BOOKS	40—51
CHAP. IV.—THE USE OF JEHOVAH IN THE PSALMS .	52—89
CHAP. V.—SIGNS OF TIME IN THE FIRST FOUR BOOKS .	90—114
CHAP. VI.—THE TRUE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST FOUR BOOKS	115—153
CHAP. VII.—DEUTERONOMY,—PHRASEOLOGY AND STYLE	154—208
CHAP. VIII. — DEUTERONOMY, — DISCREPANCIES WITH PREVIOUS NARRATIVE AND LAWS .	209—257
CHAP. IX.—DEUTERONOMY,—SIGNS OF TIME . .	258—293
CHAP. X.—THE BOOK OF JOSHUA	294—304
CHAP. XI.—THE PENTATEUCH AND ITS OBSERVANCE .	305—320
CHAP. XII.—CONCLUDING REMARKS	321—331
APPENDIX I.—BISHOP COLENSO'S REMARKS ON PREVIOUS VOLUME	332—336
APPENDIX II.—CORRECTIONS TO PREVIOUS VOLUME .	337—339
APPENDIX III.—ADDITIONAL NOTES ON SOME POINTS OF INTEREST	340—345
APPENDIX IV.—TESTIMONY TO THE FACTS OF THE PENTATEUCH	346—348

INTRODUCTION.

To estimate aright the value of any particular portion of a lengthy train of argument, it is essential that we should first of all have a clear and accurate view of its relation to the whole, and especially of its dependence or independence in regard to what has been already advanced. This is more especially necessary, when any of the earlier stages of the argument have appeared to be uncertain or erroneous; since in this case the later portions will often not require any special refutation, but will fall to the ground of themselves, directly their dependence upon such weak conclusions is made apparent. If, on the other hand, the first steps of the argument are firmly established, the later, although weak in themselves, will often be found impossible to overturn, from their close connection with what has gone before. Much always depends upon the stand-point from which a subject is viewed. First, then, see whose stand-point is right,—your opponents or yours,—and then you will be able to appreciate the true nature and importance of the argument on which he is about to enter.

The application of this principle to the controversy now to be resumed, will be apparent to every one. The great object of Bishop Colenso's criticisms is to determine the amount of authority which ought to be accorded to the earlier historical books of the Old Testament; more especially with respect to the age or ages when they were written, the circumstances that called them into existence, and the objects which their writers had in view in composing them. The first volume of his work was essentially

destructive in its character, the second and third are, partially at least, constructive also. His object there was merely to expose the unsoundness of the popular view, which regarded the Pentateuch as authentic history. The result was purely negative—the Pentateuch was unhistoric, and as a consequence also unmosaic. Now, however, he proceeds a step further, and endeavours to ascertain, from a minute examination of its various parts, what its true character really is, and how it originated. Still confining himself almost exclusively to internal evidence, partly deduced from the books themselves, partly from a comparison of them with other portions of the Old Testament, he endeavours to establish three principal propositions. 1. That the Pentateuch is a *compilation*, the work of several authors living at very various ages; and not, as is commonly believed, the production of a single man. 2. That the *earliest* of these authors was probably the Prophet Samuel, the *latest* probably the Prophet Jeremiah. 3. That the object of the writers was not to hand down an authentic history either of the events narrated or the laws connected with them, but merely to convey religious Truth to the people of their *own time* in the form most calculated to produce a deep and lasting impression; in which Truth, accordingly, consists the whole value of their writings. This last proposition is manifestly by far the most important practically, as it contains the positive view of these books, which Bishop Colenso would substitute for that commonly held. It is one, however, whose validity is wholly dependent upon the concession of that previous proposition already fully discussed*—the alleged unhistoric character of the narrative. Multitudes of histories are written concerning bygone times, at periods far more distant from the events narrated, than those supposed by Bishop Colenso in regard to ancient Jewish history. But to question their truthfulness, still more the intention of their writers in composing them, merely on this ground,—that they

* See 'The Historic Character of the Pentateuch Vindicated.'

date many centuries after the occurrences treated of,—would be simply absurd. Contemporaneous histories, though of course always the most valuable and trustworthy, are everywhere the exception, later compilations the rule. The only case, then, in which a later history can reasonably be undervalued on that account, is where it appears that the author had no reliable *materials* on which to base his narrative; or, if he had, yet failed to avail himself of them as he might. Now, of the materials for the past history of their nation, which might have been in the possession of Samuel or Jeremiah, or any of the intermediate Prophets, we know absolutely nothing. They may have been so abundant and trustworthy as to render their narrative almost as valuable as one composed by a contemporary; or they may have been as vague and valueless as Bishop Colenso supposes; mere floating traditions, distorted and exaggerated by the lapse of time. Beyond the internal evidence of the books themselves, we have no testimony whatever to the point. To assume from this the absence of such materials, would manifestly be simply begging the whole question at issue. And with respect to the internal evidence, even if it should appear on investigation that they were written, as Bishop Colenso supposes, by several authors, and in much later ages, yet if it be but conceded that their narrative is consistent and probable, there will be abundant reason on this ground alone for believing that the writers *were* possessed of such materials as would enable them to write an authentic account of their nation's origin and early history. The mere concession of later authorship would not, therefore, materially affect the real point at issue—the character and authority of the books; except, indeed, such later authorship be itself inconsistent with their statements, or the evidence adduced in its favour be of such a kind as to affect their authenticity as well as their date.

The close connection between this portion of the argument and that already discussed, is thus apparent. If Bishop Colenso's former proposition, that the books of Moses are unhistorical, has

been fairly established, not only does their later origin follow as a matter of course, but the whole of his theory concerning their purport and origin, will acquire plausibility and substance; while the gravest discrepances between it and the statements of the books themselves will be readily disposed of by a reference to the unreliable character of their contents generally. If, however, the former part of his argument be regarded as futile, and inconsistent with the manifest character of the books, then the question of their later origin must be decided entirely on its own merits, and mainly from those very statements in themselves, which he would utterly ignore. It is impossible for us, therefore, to regard these later portions of his argument from the same stand-point as himself. He enters the field with the firm conviction that the history is unreliable and erroneous; *we*, that it is trustworthy and authentic. The evidence which he adduces is viewed by *him* in its connection with what has gone before, and as gaining weight and firmness thereby; with *us* it necessarily stands by itself, and must be judged solely by its own merits. If it be sufficient, when thus regarded, to render the later origin of the books the more probable view, this will readily be conceded, since, as already remarked, the authenticity of a history by no means involves its contemporaneous origin. But it will be evident to all, that for this purpose far *stronger* evidence may be and ought to be required, than would have been necessary had the first step of his argument been fairly made out.

Bishop Colenso, however, would fain represent the connection between the successive stages of his argument as in some respects the reverse of this. So much so, indeed, that he actually excuses himself from the task of replying to the refutations of his first Part, by referring to the evidence adduced in his third:—

"It is obvious, that, *if* the arguments produced in this Part, shall appear to be valid, the objections to my reasonings in Part I. may, for the most part, be dismissed at once as merely ingenious attempts . . . . to build up a theory, which has no real foundation in fact, and which falls at last by the weight of its

own cumbrous additions, and must be swept away together with them."—(Pref.,Part III.,p.viii.)

Really, however, (as before remarked) there are only two cases in which these later inquiries can have any reflex influence on his previous position. With respect to the first of these we may observe, that if it should appear on investigation that the later origin of the Pentateuch is distinctly implied by its own internal evidence, and is yet at the same time inconsistent with its own statements, then the conclusion to be deduced would be, not that it was legendary, but that it was a deliberate forgery. And whatever may have been the possible motives of its authors, its contents could not but be regarded with the gravest suspicion, its character be sunk far lower than even Bishop Colenso would desire. Every principle of our moral nature shrinks from so repulsive and self-contradictory a supposition, as that the chosen medium for conveying Divine Truth to men should have been deliberate forgery. Ignorance, and even error, in respect of things indifferent to their true mission, may be admitted as conceivable in the sacred writers, without any real detriment to their authority or inspiration; but surely not intentional dishonesty or wilful falsehood. Looking from our stand-point, however, such a conclusion is eminently improbable; for, believing as we do the history to be authentic, we should naturally attach the first importance to the books' own testimony as to their origin and author, and strong indeed must be the indirect evidence which should lead us to ignore it. We turn, then, to the second case referred to above, where the signs of later origin are drawn from the subject matter of the books, and hence affect the accuracy of the narrative as well as its date. It is clear, however, that in order to do this they must be something more than mere anachronisms in names or phrases, which will often be found in the most authentic histories; since every writer naturally speaks of places and things by those names which will be most readily understood at the time *in* which he writes, whether such names were known at the

time *of* which he writes or not. It is of course, in reality, a grave anachronism to call an Israelite a 'Jew' before the secession of the ten tribes. Yet to impeach the veracity of Dean Stanley or Dean Milman on such a ground as this would be manifestly absurd. The translators of our authorized version, again, no doubt committed an anachronism in following the Septuagint and Vulgate, when they put the word 'Lord' into the mouths of the Patriarchs and Prophets, instead of the original 'Jehovah,' or its English equivalent 'the Eternal.' Yet surely none would venture to deny the authenticity of the history as it now stands in either of those three versions, on such a paltry ground as this. It is only when anachronisms concern essential portions of the narrative (as, for instance, if a certain law were represented as in actual operation before it was in fact ordained, or other similar cases) that they can be fairly urged as objections to the reliability of a history. Very few of Bishop Colenso's later arguments will be found to be of this kind, and hence but little weight can be assigned to them as a whole in the discussion of this fundamental point.

Viewed, therefore, from our stand-point, with the result of our previous investigations* carefully borne in mind, these later inquiries of Bishop Colenso, though highly interesting and important in themselves, cannot be regarded as having much influence on the main point at issue in the present controversy. A record of creation and patriarchal history by the hand of Samuel, a narrative of the Exodus and the legislation in the wilderness by Nathan or Gad, a collection of the closing addresses of Moses, edited (with some alterations of phraseology, perhaps) by Jeremiah, would be scarcely less valuable in the eyes of Jews or Christians, than the same, writ every word by the great law-giver

* The strictures of Bishop Colenso upon the arguments advanced in the previous volume, will be found fully considered and commented on in Appendix No 1.

himself. Not that we would, on that account, lightly concede these positions as innocent and unimportant. Far from it. For though the religious character or historic accuracy of the Pentateuch be not necessarily affected by its later origin, yet assuredly its credibility, its force and influence, will be much enhanced and strengthened by the weight of contemporaneous origin. The testimony of eye-witnesses is always more readily believed and more impressive than that of others, albeit quite as truthful and reliable, who obtained their information but at second-hand. Although, therefore, the proof of later origin might not deprive us of aught of the *substance* which we prize so dearly; yet the proof of contemporaneous origin would assuredly tend to heighten its value, and increase our interest and trust in its details; the subject is hence well worthy of our closest study.

The discussion of the date and authorship of ancient writings has become, indeed, of late, one of the most conspicuous features of literary criticism and controversy, nor was it probable, or indeed desirable, that the sacred writings of the Jewish and Christian Churches should be exempted from the same rigorous investigation to which all other ancient writings were so freely subjected. On this ground there is certainly no just cause for complaint. Nor, further, can we object to the same principles and rules being applied to the critical examination of Sacred literature, as have been found by experience to be just and wholesome in the study of profane. The nature of the writings, and the character and object of the reputed authors, must of course be carefully borne in mind throughout; exceptional in many respects from all else in the domain of literature, as these certainly are. This, however, is no more than would be claimed in regard to any other work which might be selected for investigation. The allowance to be made on this account in the case of Scripture may be, indeed, peculiar, but the *principle* on which the allowance is made is one of universal application. This much premised, we proceed to consider briefly the special rules by which the critic must be guided in discussing

questions of this kind, in addition to those general principles of interpretation already laid down.*

External evidence is that which naturally first claims attention. The commonly received opinion concerning the origin of the work in question is traced back to the earliest ages where it is mentioned or alluded to, especial regard being had to any diversity of opinion previously existing, and also to any testimony concerning it to be discovered in the works of well-informed or very early writers. If it appears that tradition has always assigned it to one particular source, this of course affords a certain amount of presumption in favour of its having been written at the time alleged. A presumption weakened, so as to be almost worthless, by the discovery of conflicting testimony in earlier ages, and strengthened, so as to be almost conclusive, by the existence of testimony nearly approaching to the date assigned. This latter, however, is a case which scarcely ever occurs in respect to very ancient writings, from the small remains of contemporaneous literature which have come down to us. The consentient voice of tradition, first heard, perhaps, several centuries after the composition of the work, is generally all the external evidence at our disposal; incapable, therefore, of doing more than furnishing a weak presumption as to its origin, just sufficient to throw the burden of proof on to the other side, but otherwise of little value.

The great field of modern criticism is, and always must be, internal evidence. Less apparently conclusive, indeed, than external testimony, yet often, from its variety and indirectness, really more trustworthy and convincing. While the skill required in its development, and the greater intellectual effort in its appreciation, will ever render it more interesting and attractive to the critic; for which very reason it requires to be used with all the greater caution.

---

* See 'Historic Character of the Pentateuch,' Introduction, p.xiii.-vi.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that any direct claim of authorship or date contained in the work itself must always be regarded as the most conclusive evidence imaginable, since nothing but the assumption of forgery can overturn it, and this of course can never be admitted except on the ground of the most overwhelming indirect evidence, especially if the work be of a serious and moral character. In the case of the Sacred writings, as already remarked, the supposition of forgery would involve the rejection also of their inspired character, and would hence require even stronger evidence in support of it than in the case of a profane work.* Should no such distinct claim of origin be found, attention must then be given to any *indirect* allusions or indications of the same. These, though less valuable, and often very liable to exaggeration and misinterpretation, yet will frequently be found to throw much light upon the question, and be especially useful in negativing unsound theories. They are seldom sufficiently numerous or unambiguous to be decisive positively.

But the most important internal evidence is to be found generally in the *subject-matter* of the work. The writer's way of speaking of things, of names and places, of customs and laws, and such like, will generally be a pretty safe guide to the date at which he wrote. Since to abstain from anachronisms in such things throughout a work of any length, especially if unstudied in its character, is all but impossible. To make this evidence conclusive, however, it is clearly necessary that we should have an intimate acquaintance, from independent sources, with the times in which the reputed author lived, as also with the various changes wrought in these respects in subsequent periods. Without such standards of comparison, this argument will be little

* The only exception to this rule would be where it appeared that the writer never intended definitely to ascribe his work to another author, but was throughout writing manifest and unconcealed *fiction*, in which of course the utmost license might be allowed, without in any way affecting the good faith or honesty of the writer.

better than conjecture. With them, it will often amount to moral certainty. In no case, however, can it do more than decide the question of *age*, leaving that of particular authorship untouched.

Lastly, there is the evidence deducible from phraseology and style. The former of these is with some a favourite ground of argument, though really one of the least reliable. No doubt nearly every writer has certain pet words and characteristic phrases which he employs more frequently than others do. Yet if his writings be carefully scrutinised, very many long passages may generally be found, sometimes even entire works, in which these are altogether wanting. Whatever value, therefore, may attach to the *presence* of such words or phrases, as a proof of common authorship, it is clear that their *absence*, as a proof of diverse authorship, is worth very little; except, indeed, the absence be so constant and remarkable (the subject-matter requiring the presence of the words in question, were the authors identical) as to be plainly characteristic. But few, moreover, of the words which commonly find a place in the lists of peculiarities compiled by literary critics, can fairly be considered characteristic. This is best seen by a comparison of many diverse works of the same author. Take, for example, the undisputed Epistles of St. Paul, or two such works as the Gospel of St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, or, to select an instance from profane literature, the plays of Shakespeare, and let the phraseology of each separate work be carefully examined and tabulated, and how easily might long lists of peculiar words and phrases be constructed, apparently contradictory of that common origin which is yet admitted on all hands to be beyond dispute. The less we know, then, of an author's writings, the fewer of his works we possess, the more wary must we be in deciding what words are really characteristic of his style, what merely accidentally common.

But besides this general uncertainty respecting the true value of phraseology as an argument, there are several special reasons

why we should employ it with caution. Thus it is to be remembered, that differences of subject, of occasion, or of age, will often produce differences in phraseology in the works of a single author quite as marked as those distinguishing one author from another. That in the oft-repeated transcription of ancient writings nothing would be more likely to occur than the alteration of peculiar words and obsolete phrases for their better-known equivalents; so that very often we really cannot be sure whether we *have* the original words whereon to argue or not. And yet again, that much similarity between earlier and later writers may frequently arise from *imitation*, either voluntary or involuntary. These things duly considered, it seems plain that divergences or agreements of phraseology, though always worth examining, and sometimes of great importance, are yet, on the whole, far less reliable signs of date or authorship than those previously enumerated, or than that of which we have yet to speak—Style. Less subject to variation than phraseology, presenting few opportunities for alteration in transcribing, and far more difficult to imitate, the style of any work, although incapable of rigorous definition or mathematical statement, often, indeed, impossible to describe at all, will ever be to the critical student one of the most convincing proofs of its authorship. As expressed in words, indeed, the differences of style which distinguish one writer from another may often appear few and insignificant; they require to be discerned and felt in the works themselves to be appreciated; and will generally be found most sensible and least definable in the works of the greatest authors.

To attempt to express at all precisely the amount of weight which should be accorded to each of these kinds of evidence in any particular case, would be a hopeless task; so much must always depend upon the special circumstances connected with it. To note a few of the more important of these, which are most likely to occur, and have most disturbing influence, will be the utmost we can do. They are chiefly three:—

1. *The absence of any other similar works by the author whose claims are under discussion.* This will principally affect the evidence deducible from phraseology, and, in a less degree, from style also, so as to make it little better than uncertain conjecture. As already remarked, differences of subject or occasion may often render such works as do exist practically useless for comparison.

2. *The absence of any well-authenticated contemporaneous literature, or reliable history.* This also will affect the evidence of phraseology in no slight degree, especially when used to determine date rather than authorship. Many points of internal evidence based upon subject-matter will also be rendered doubtful and obscure by a lack of accurate knowledge of the times in question.

3. *Repeated transcription in later ages* will, as before observed, be a fruitful source of incongruities in phraseology, and not infrequently also of anachronisms in less important matters.

One point only yet remains to be considered, before we proceed to apply these principles to the subject in hand, and that is the evidence which should warrant us in pronouncing any passage an *interpolation.* This is very commonly done merely on the ground of phraseology, without respect to subject-matter or connection. In fact, many of the so-called characteristic differences between the various parts of the Pentateuch are only maintained by an elaborate theory of interpolations, based upon the presence or absence of those very words and phrases which it is desired to prove are characteristic of diverse authorship. This mode of reasoning may be fairly represented thus:—There are two sections of considerable length, A and B, each of which is distinguished from the other by certain peculiar words and phrases. It so happens, however, that several of A's peculiarities are to be found in B; not a few also of B's exist unquestionably in A as well; a circumstance apparently fatal to the whole argument. An ingenious criticism determines, however, that the words and phrases *are* characteristic notwithstanding, but that *both* sections

contain interpolations from the other. All the passages in A which contain B's peculiarities are ascribed to the corrections or additions of the later writer. All those in B which contain A's peculiarities are passages of the earlier writer adopted and incorporated with his own matter by the later *uncorrected*. And so the conclusion is drawn that these peculiarities *are* certainly characteristic of the two writers, and the idea of a common origin of the sections A and B is absurd. Of course all this is quite possible, but, at the same time, it is also quite hypothetical, and, as an argument, simply worthless. Even its ingenuity cannot make amends for the large amount of assumption and circle-reasoning which it involves, or justify us in adopting such a line of argument in determining the point in question. The only grounds on which a passage can be fairly set down as certainly an interpolation must surely be, either its lack of connection in subject or style with its immediate context, or its incongruity with the well-established conclusions of independent reasoning, to concede which would involve greater improbabilities than the assumption of an interpolation. This latter, however, would be a very different case from that just described, where interpolations are assumed in order to prove *that* which is to prove them so. On either of these two grounds, then—want of connection with the context, or incongruity with the results of independent and powerful reasoning,—we are prepared to grant interpolations, but on no others.

Having now passed in review the most important rules and principles by which our inquiries must be guided, we proceed to apply them to the detailed discussion of the question before us —whether the Pentateuch did actually originate in the days and from the pen of Moses, as is commonly supposed, or not.

AUTHORITIES REFERRED TO.

The Authorized Version of the Bible.

De Wette's German Version (4th Edition).

Dr. Benisch's Hebrew and English Bible.

Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, translated Chris. Leo (2 vols., 1825).

Furst's Hebrew Concordance (3 vols., 1840).

Dr. S. Davidson's Revision of Heb. Text of Old Test.

Prof. Rawlinson's Bampton Lectures, 1859 (2nd Edition).

Prof. Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies, Vol. I.

Sir J. Gard. Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians (2 vols., 1854).

Dean Stanley's Sinai and Palestine.

Hugh Miller's Testimony of the Rocks.

Dr. Benisch's Reply to Part I. of Bishop Colenso.

Niebuhr's Description de l'Arabie.

Dr. Shaw's Travels in the Levant (2nd Edition, 1757).

'Aids to Faith', Essays of Dr. McCaul and Prof. Rawlinson.

THE

MOSAIC ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH

CONSIDERED,

&c. &c.

CHAPTER I.

EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOUR OF THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

(BISHOP COLENSO, PART II., CHAP. III., P. 186—190.)

FOR many ages it has been the unanimous opinion both of Jews and Christians, that the first five books in the Bible were the work of the great leader and law-giver, with whose deeds and words so large a portion of them is concerned. Yet is there perhaps no point on which the greatest scholars and critics (rationalists) of the present day are more completely agreed, than the denial of his authorship. Differing considerably among themselves as to who *did* write the Pentateuch, they all with one voice declare—it was not Moses. It is the object of our present inquiry to determine, so far as we can, whose witness is to be preferred—the voice of antiquity and old tradition, or the voice of modern learning and research. And to this end we shall first of all consider the *a priori* evidence on which the old view rests, and then secondly proceed to examine minutely into the counter-

evidence adduced by recent critics. To accomplish the first of these designs is the purpose of the present chapter.

The principal ground on which the common belief of Jews and Christians in the Mosaic authorship rests, is certainly tradition. They have always been told that Moses wrote it, and therefore they believe that he did. How long, then, has this tradition concerning its origin existed? Certainly ever since the commencement of the present era, probably up to the times of the restoration from Babylon.* Further than this we cannot trace it; the books are referred to, indeed, not infrequently by writers living in yet earlier times, but not in such a way as to give us any clue to the view commonly entertained as to their authorship. The earliest external testimony in our possession being thus above a thousand years later than the reputed date of the books themselves, it cannot clearly be allowed much weight in deciding the question at issue. Sufficient indeed to warrant belief, in the absence of all countervailing evidence; in the face of such evidence it can do no more than just throw the burden of proof on to the other side. It is to be remembered, too, that very much of the earlier testimony which we have is ambiguous and indecisive. We have continual mention of the 'law of Moses,' or the 'Commandments of God by the hand of Moses,' occasionally of the 'book of Moses,' none of which expressions, however, as already remarked,† necessarily imply that the books were regarded as Moses' writings, or even as written in his times. Viewed in connection with the more distinct testimony of still later ages, indeed, it is very probable that this *was* the sense in which such phrases were employed; but as we have no proof that it was so, it is of course impossible to insist upon them as decisive. The ease, moreover, with which the idea of Mosaic authorship might have attached

* This is so universally admitted that it seems unnecessary to adduce any evidence in support of it. For details respecting *foreign* testimony to the Pentateuch, see Rawlinson's 'Bampton Lectures,' p.262-7.

† See 'Historic Character of the Pentateuch,' Appendix No.I.,p.200.

itself to books, the greater part of which were taken up with Moses' words and deeds, without any special tradition in support of it, must always be borne in mind, as tending to diminish still further the value of testimony so far removed from the age in which he lived.

We pass now to the consideration of the Internal evidence which may be advanced in favour of Mosaic authorship. This is commonly regarded as very strong; and of course, if the authenticity of the narrative be conceded, it follows at once that large sections, such for instance as the parting addresses in Deuteronomy, and the various legislative enactments in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, must be ascribed to Moses. It does *not* follow, however, that Moses therefore wrote the narrative as well, or himself arranged these addresses and laws in their present form. Nor does the fact, that on two or three occasions Moses is said to have put the laws delivered to him by God into writing (Ex.xxiv.4,7, Deut.xvii.18, xxviii.58,xxix.20,27,xxxi.9,22,24-26) in any way affect the question; being a circumstance, indeed, if anything more likely to be recorded by an independent historian than by the law-giver himself. The direct internal evidence for the Mosaic authorship of the narrative consists in truth of two solitary passages; Ex.xvii.14, where Jehovah commands Moses to write an account of Amalek's attack, and the curse pronounced against him, for 'a memorial in a book'; and Nu.xxxiii.2, where it is stated that 'Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of Jehovah; and these are their journeys according to their goings out.' The latter of which certainly seems to imply that the writer of that chapter, at all events, was *not* Moses, but rather some one else who merely derived his information from Moses' list. These two passages serve, however, to establish the fact (which will be of importance hereafter), that Moses did certainly write accounts of some of the notable events recorded in the Pentateuch, though not perhaps of all.

Of indirect indications of authorship there are but few to be found, and these by no means decisive. On the one hand we have the intimate acquaintance of the author with circumstances peculiar to Moses, such for instance as the interviews with God at the Burning Bush, in Mount Sinai, and on other occasions, which, it might be urged, an independent writer would have known nothing about. It needs but to turn, however, to the parallel cases in the history of the Patriarchs, and also of our Saviour, recorded with equal fulness, yet certainly by other hands, and the little value which can be attached to such an argument will be at once apparent. On the other hand, there are certainly several passages and expressions concerning Moses, which, though not absolutely irreconcileable with the idea of his authorship, yet seem more natural and appropriate if ascribed to another hand, a spectator of the events rather than the chief actor in them. They are the following: Ex.vi.26-7, 'These are that Aaron and Moses, to whom Jehovah said, Bring out the children of Israel from the land of Egypt according to their hosts. These are they who spake to Pharaoh king of Egypt, to bring out the children of Israel from Egypt: these are that Moses and Aaron.' Ex.xi.3, 'Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his people.' Nu.xii.3, 'Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men who were upon the face of the earth.' Deut.xxxiii.1, 'And this is the blessing, wherewith Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death.' Lastly, there is the narrative of Moses' death and burial, in Deut.xxxiv., with the remarkable expressions in *v.*6,10, 'no man knoweth of his sepulchre *unto this day*,' and 'there arose not a prophet *since* in Israel like unto Moses.' A narrative which cannot, without the most extravagant and unwarranted assumptions, be supposed to have been written by Moses himself. Some of these instances may no doubt be explained as interpolations of later writers; as will be seen hereafter (see chap.vi.). Others have every appearance of being

inherent parts of the narrative, and as such furnish an argument of considerable weight, not indeed, as Bishop Colenso urges, in favour of the *later* origin of the Pentateuch as a whole, but certainly in favour of the non-Mosaic origin of certain parts. The consideration of the arguments deducible from subject-matter and phraseology will engage our attention further on. Our object here was merely to ascertain the value of the commonly received opinion, and the more manifest proofs of authorship, on which that opinion is supposed to rest. And the conclusion to be deduced from our inquiries appears to be this:—That while there is a certain general presumption, arising from tradition, in favour of the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch, and clear internal testimony to the direct Mosaic authorship of certain parts, and the indirect authorship of very much of the remainder; yet that there are also several indications of no little weight and importance, that other portions are as certainly due to distinct and later hands.*

* It is very commonly asserted that the author of the historical books of the Pentateuch 'wishes to be regarded as Moses,' or 'implies by his manner that he is Moses,' without, however, any proof being offered to that end. Such general *impressions* may very commonly be traced to prejudice, or habit. The belief in the Mosaic authorship has become firmly rooted in our minds, and when we hear it questioned and are asked our reasons for believing as we do, we naturally shrink from ascribing it all to mere hearsay, and so willingly fancy that our belief is founded upon characteristics contained in the Pentateuch, which yet we search for afterwards in vain. Much also arises from confounding the absence of difficulties with the presence of proofs. We read the Pentateuch with the conviction that it is Mosaic, and we meet with little or nothing which seems inconsistent with that view, which we immediately regard as an evidence of its truth. Whereas had we read it with the firm conviction that it was written by Aaron, or Eleazar, or Joshua, or any other of the men of those times, we should have equally found everything consistent and harmonious. This is the most convincing way of satisfying oneself of the real absence of any such overpowering internal evidence as is commonly assumed to exist. If any one doubts, let him try.

CHAPTER II.

SIGNS OF COMPILATION IN THE EARLIER BOOKS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

(BISHOP COLENSO, PART II., CHAP. I.—II., P. 170—185.)

AN examination of the *a priori* external and internal evidence respecting the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch having failed to establish any strong presumption in its favour, we proceed now to consider at length the evidence adduced by Bishop Colenso in support of the diverse and later origin of its various parts. His theory concerning it may be briefly summed up as follows:—

The Pentateuch (including also the Book of Joshua) is a compilation from *three* principal sources.

1st. There was a series of parabolic or legendary narratives written in the days of Saul, founded in part probably on the vague reminiscences and traditions of the people, and intended for their instruction in religious Truth. Narratives commencing with the Creation, and embracing the chief events in Patriarchal history up to the Exodus, with some fragments also concerning later times. Their distinguishing feature is the absence of the name 'Jehovah' (E.V. LORD), instead of which they always have the more ancient name 'Elohim' (E.V. God), whence they are commonly described as *Elohistic* sections. The author of these portions (originally probably one continuous narrative) was very likely the Prophet Samuel.

2nd. A further series of similar writings, carrying on the narrative to the death of Joshua, were composed during the reigns of David and Solomon; together with a collection of sacrificial and other sacerdotal laws compiled at the same time for the use of the Tabernacle or Temple at Jerusalem. The authors of these portions incorporated with their own writings large portions of the Elohistic matter already composed, occasionally, however, altering, enlarging, or replacing certain parts with their own composition. The

Books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Joshua are mainly due to their labours, besides numerous sections in the Book of Genesis. The characteristic feature of these portions (in contrast to the first) is the prevalence of the name 'Jehovah' wherever the idiom of the language will allow of its substitution for 'Elohim', they are therefore distinguished by the name of *Jehovistic* sections. Their authors were probably the Prophets Nathan and Gad, or some others of the same school and period.

3rd. Some smaller corrections and additions to the work thus formed are due to a still later writer, who lived in the reign of Josiah, to whom also the entire Book of Deuteronomy is to be ascribed, with the exception of a few passages which he adopted out of earlier records. This writer is generally spoken of as the Deuteronomist, and was probably none other than the Prophet Jeremiah.

Putting aside for the present that part of the theory which concerns the Book of Deuteronomy, and the final revision of the other books, we shall proceed to consider the evidence adduced in support (1) of the division of these latter into Elohistic and Jehovistic sections, and (2) of the dates assigned to each. Two questions, it will be observed, quite distinct from one another, and each requiring clear and independent proof; the first of which will engage our attention in the present chapter, while the second will be treated of in the four immediately succeeding ones.

The origin and meaning of the two names 'Elohim' and 'Jehovah,' which are said to characterize the different sections of the earlier Books of the Pentateuch, are so fully considered by Bishop Colenso (Part II.p.256-60), and the laws concerning their usage so fairly laid down, that it will be quite unnecessary to discuss them here at any length. It will be sufficient for our purpose to observe, that 'Elohim' or 'God' is the *generic* name of the Deity, signifying 'things fearful or terrible' (the word is plural), and may be used of any god whatever, or even in some cases of men in exalted and authoritative positions; and that equivalent words, derived from the same root, are to be found in other kindred languages besides the Hebrew.* That 'Jehovah,' on the contrary, is peculiar to the Hebrews, being the *specific*

* *E.g.* the well-known Arabic name for God—'Allah.'

name by which the object of their worship was distinguished from those of other nations; signifying 'eternal self-existence,'—'I AM THAT I AM,'—and incapable therefore of being applied to any other being. It is further to be noted, that whenever the purpose of the writer is to contrast *divine* with *human*, Elohim will always be preferred, whichever may be in other cases his favourite word. Its employment is also necessary whenever the name of God is qualified by connection with some other object, as, for example, in the phrases 'my God,' 'the God of Israel,' &c. To insert 'Jehovah' in such cases would be contrary to Hebrew idiom.* Whence it follows, that while it is quite possible for a writer to use Elohim to the entire exclusion of Jehovah, it will often be impossible for him to do the reverse, and exclude Elohim altogether, however much he may prefer Jehovah. Taking these facts as our guide, we inquire, 1. Do the earlier books of the Pentateuch present the phenomena asserted by Bishop Colenso? And, 2. Are these phenomena such as to warrant us in regarding them as a compilation? A brief review of the book of Genesis will be the best means of satisfying our minds on the first of these points. The second will require a wider field and closer study.

Gen.i.-ii.4 (the account of the six days' work of creation) contains Elohim 35 times (once preferable), Jehovah not once.

Gen.ii.4-iv. (the history of Adam and Eve, and Cain and Abel) contains Jehovah 10 times, Jehovah Elohim 20 times, Elohim alone 4 times (3 times in the mouth of the Serpent).

Gen.v. (the genealogies from Adam to Noah) contains Elohim 5 times (once preferable), Jehovah once (*v.*29)

Gen.vi.1-8 (the first part of the history of the deluge) contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim not once.

Gen.vi.9-22 (the same continued) contains Elohim 5 times, Jehovah not once.

Gen.vii.1-5 (the same continued) contains Jehovah twice, Elohim not once.

Gen.vii.6-viii.19 (the same concluded) contains Elohim 5 times, Jehovah once (vii.16).

---

* The only exception to this rule is the phrase 'Jehovah of Hosts.'

Gen.viii.20-2 (the sacrifice of Noah) contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim not once.

Gen.ix.1-19,28-9 (the covenant with Noah) contains Elohim 6 times (once preferable) Jehovah not once.

Gen.ix.20-7 (the misconduct and curse of Canaan) contains Jehovah Elohim once, Elohim once.

Gen.x. (the genealogies of the sons of Noah) contains Jehovah twice (*v.*9.), Elohim not at all.

Gen.xi.1-9 (the confusion of tongues) contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim not once.

Gen.xi.10-32 (the genealogy of Abram) contains neither name.

Gen.xii.-iii. (the early history of Abram) contain Jehovah 13 times, Elohim not once.

Gen.xiv. (the war of Sodom) contains Elohim 4 times (all necessary) Jehovah once (*v.*22).

Gen.xv.-vi. (the further history of Abram) contain Jehovah 15 times, Elohim not once.

Gen.xvii. (the same continued) contains Elohim 10 times (three times necessary), Jehovah once (*v.*1.)

Gen.xviii.-ix. (the visit of the angels, and the destruction of Sodom) contain Jehovah 17 times, Elohim twice (xix.29).

Gen.xx.-xxii.10 (the further history of Abraham) contain Elohim 22 times (once necessary), Jehovah 4 times (xx.18,xxi.1,33).

Gen.xxii.11-19 (the same continued) contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim once (*v.*12).

Gen.xxii.20-xxiii. (the same continued) contain Elohim once, Jehovah not at all.

Gen.xxiv. (the same continued) contains Jehovah 14 times, Jehovah Elohim 5 times, Elohim alone twice (both necessary).

Gen.xxv.1-20 (the death of Abraham, and account of Ishmael) contains Elohim once, Jehovah not at all.

Gen.xxv.21-xxvii. (the history of Isaac) contain Jehovah 14 times, Elohim 3 three times (twice necessary).

Gen.xxviii.1-9 (the departure of Jacob) contains Elohim twice (once necessary), Jehovah not at all.

Gen.xxviii.10-xxxi.3 (the further history of Jacob) contain Jehovah 12 times, Elohim 16 times (4 times necessary, once preferable).

Gen.xxxi.4-xxxvii. (the same continued, and commencement of the history of Joseph) contain Elohim 36 times (11 times necessary, once preferable), Jehovah twice (xxxi.49,xxxii.9).

Gen.xxxviii. (the history of Judah) contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim not once.

Gen. xxxix.-xlii.4 (the continuation of the history of Joseph) contain Jehovah 8 times, Elohim 11 times (9 times in conversations with Egyptians).

Gen. xlii.5-l. (the remainder of the history of Joseph) contain Elohim 26 times (8 times necessary, once preferable), Jehovah once (xlix.18).

The results of this review of the book of Genesis may be shortly summed up as follows:—

1. There are numerous sections, some of considerable length, which contain Jehovah frequently, but Elohim never, except when absolutely necessary (Gen.vi.1-8,vii.1-5,viii.20-2,xi.1-9,xii.-iii.,xv.-vi.,xxiv.,xxxviii.); several, also, which contain Jehovah very commonly, and Elohim but seldom (Gen.ii.4,-iv.,xviii.-ix. xxii.11-9,xxv.21-xxvii.). These passages, which contain Jehovah in all 131 times, and Elohim only 12 times (4 necessary), may fairly therefore be set down as *Jehovistic*.

2. There are several sections in which precisely the reverse is the case, Elohim being frequently employed, but Jehovah never (Gen.i.-ii.4,vi.9-22,ix.1-19,xxii.20,-xxiii,xxv.1-20,xxviii.1-9). These, which contain Elohim in all 50 times (once necessary, twice preferable), are as clearly *Elohistic*.

3. There are numerous sections which contain Elohim very commonly, and Jehovah very rarely (Gen.v.,vii.6-viii.19,xvii.,xx.-xxii. 10,xxxi.4-xxxvii.,xlii.5-l.). These, which contain Elohim in all 104 times (23 times necessary, 4 preferable), and Jehovah only 10 times, may be considered as Elohistic passages, slightly altered by the subsequent Jehovist writer.

4. There remain two important sections in which the names are employed almost equally (Gen.xxviii.10-xxxi.3,xxxix.-xlii.4). These, which contain Jehovah 20 times and Elohim 27 times (4 necessary, once preferable), must be explained by the assumption, either that the original Elohistic narrative has been very largely corrected by the later writer, or else that the Jehovist incorporated a good deal of the Elohist's composition in his own work. The other sections either do not contain the names at all, or not frequently enough to enable us to decide to which they belong.

In making the above analysis, we have represented the matter as favourably for Bishop Colenso's theory as possible, many of the divisions named being purely arbitrary, made to suit the theory, not really grounds on which it rests. Putting these, however, on

one side, there still remain a number of sections clearly defined and distinct, which do certainly differ remarkably in their usage of the two divine names. Gen.ii.4-iv.xi.1-9,xii.-iii.,xv.-vi.,xviii.-ix.,xxiv.,xxxviii. are all well-marked and separate portions of the narrative, which contain Jehovah 91 times, Elohim only 8 times (twice necessary). Gen.i.-ii.4,xvii.,xlii.5-l. are also passages clearly defined and distinct, which contain Elohim 71 times (11 times necessary, twice preferable), Jehovah only twice. Such a phenomenon certainly calls for explanation. Bishop Colenso solves it by supposing two authors; and there can be no doubt but that his theory, although involving a good deal of assumption, and beset with several difficulties, is quite adequate to account for the facts of the case. This, however, must not be regarded as in any way establishing that theory as correct, for it is quite possible that there may be some other theory equally capable of explaining the phenomenon, and beset with fewer difficulties, which would hence be in every way preferable. This brings us to the second branch of our inquiry,—does the existence of these Elohistic and Jehovistic sections require us to regard those portions of the Pentateuch which contain them as a *compilation?*

As none of the internal evidence of authorship considered in the preceding chapter affects in any way the book of Genesis, with which we are now more especially concerned, it is clear that the only ground for supposing the narrative here to be Mosaic is tradition. And as the events recorded all happened long before the time of Moses, it is also clear that *if* Mosaic the information must have been obtained either from older documents or from tradition, so that nothing would be gained, so far as the value of the history is concerned, by its ascription to him. Bearing these facts in mind, we proceed now to compare the usage of the Divine names in Genesis just considered, with that in the other books of the Pentateuch, and especially in those portions of them, which both tradition and internal evidence would lead us to ascribe most certainly to the hand of Moses.

Omitting here for the sake of simplicity all those cases of the occurrence of Elohim, which arise from the necessity of the Hebrew idiom, or the purpose of the writer, we turn first to the book of Deuteronomy, which consists almost wholly of the addresses and final legislation of Moses, and where therefore, if anywhere, we should expect to find the clearest evidence of Moses' usage of the two names. Now in the whole of this book of Deuteronomy there are but 5 instances of the occurrence of Elohim where Jehovah might have been substituted for it (Deut.xxi.23,xxv.18,xxxii.15, 18,xxxiii.1.), while Jehovah occurs in all 550 times.* The phraseology of Deuteronomy, then, is decidedly Jehovistic; Elohim is only to be found in isolated passages, and then but very rarely. In the Laws recorded in the book of Numbers, probably at the dictation, or under the direction of Moses, not a single instance of Elohim is to be found. In the narrative but 18 instances, 15 of which are contained in Nu.xxii.-iv. (the history of Balaam), which is by many attributed to a different author from the rest; the remaining three are in scattered passages like those in Deuteronomy (Nu. xii.13,xvi.22,xxi.5). In the book of Leviticus, which consists chiefly of laws delivered at Mount Sinai, again not a single instance of Elohim is to be found. Jehovah occurs in Numbers (omitting as before ch. xxii.-iv.) 367 times, in Leviticus 311 times;* both therefore are as decidedly Jehovistic at Deuteronomy; neither presents the slightest parallel to the phenomena exhibited in Genesis. In the laws recorded in the book of Exodus, only 6 instances of the use of Elohim are to be found (Ex.xxi.6,13.xxii.7,8,8,28), but 5 of these refer to

---

* *Vide* Bishop Colenso, Part II., p.265.

† Viz. xxi.6,xxii.7,8,8,28, where 'judges' are spoken of under this name. The only doubtful cases are xxi.6, where the ear-boring of servants is ordered to be performed before 'Elohim'; and xxii.28, 'Thou shalt not revile the gods (marg. 'authorities'), nor curse the ruler of thy people.' (E.V.) Both De Wette and Benisch, however, render the word as usual 'God.' The parallelism of the two clauses would lead us to prefer the reference to 'judges.'

man, and not to God.† In the other (xxi.13), the antithesis between *man's* act and *God's** seems a sufficient reason for its occurrence. In the narrative portions of Exodus, Elohim is somewhat commoner. Omitting chap.i.-ii.,xiii.17-9, and xviii., which are considered to be, in main at least, of Elohistic origin, and which will be considered more fully hereafter, there are 30 instances of Elohim where Jehovah might have been used instead (Ex.iii.1,4,6,11,12,13,14,15,iv.16,27,vi.2,viii.19,ix.28,xiv. 19,xvii.9,xix.3,17,19,xx.1,19,20,21,xxiv.11,13,xxxi.3,18,xxxii. 16,16,xxxv.31). In several of these, however, Elohim seems, from its opposition to the idea of *human* agency, to have a peculiar propriety (viii.19,xxxi.3,18,xxxii.16,16,xxxv.31); in two others also Jehovah would certainly seem less in place than Elohim.† Jehovah occurs in the book of Exodus (omitting as before ch. xviii.) 393 times, so that it also must be considered as decidedly Jehovistic. The main portions of the four last books being thus seen to be invariably and characteristically Jehovistic, it only now remains to consider those excepted passages, which are by many ascribed to other authorship. The following is an analysis of the usage followed in these passages :—

Ex.i.-ii. (the oppression of the Israelites, and early history of Moses) contain Elohim 8 times, Jehovah not once.

Ex.xiii.17-9 (part of the account of the Exodus) contains Elohim 4 times, Jehovah not once.

Ex.xviii. (the visit of Jethro to Moses) contains Elohim 11 times, Jehovah 5 times.

Nu.xxii.-iv. (the history of Balaam) contain Elohim 15 times, Jehovah 29 times.

Only two of them, therefore, (Ex.i.-ii.,xiii.17-9) furnish the slightest parallel to the exclusively Elohistic passages discoverable in the book of Genesis, and one of these consists of but 3 verses; the others resemble most closely those doubtful passages in

* 'And if a *man* lie not in wait, but *God* deliver him into his hand.'

† Viz. Ex.iv.16, 'Thou shalt be to him instead of God;' ix.28, 'Let there be no more thunderings of God (E.V. 'mighty thunderings') and hail.'

Genesis where the two names are used so equally as to render it uncertain under which head they should be classed.

Assuming now, for the sake of argument, that the addresses and laws recorded in the later books of the Pentateuch are of Mosaic authorship, and the narrative composed at least under his direction, the case stands thus. Is it probable that Moses, when writing the history of earlier times, should have departed so widely from his uniform and characteristic usage in respect to these two divine names, as the numerous, well-defined, and lengthy Elohistic sections of the book of Genesis would imply? Is it probable that he, who was accustomed to employ Jehovah twenty-two times as often as Elohim,* should have composed such passages as Gen.i.-ii.4,xvii.,xlii.5-l. where Elohim is found twenty-nine times as often as Jehovah? It must be admitted, that the facts before us furnish a very strong presumption against such an idea. Not that we would therefore lay it down as a principle, that the same writer could not at one time employ one name, and at another the other; or that the occurrence of a few verses containing the one, found among those where the other was prevalent, is a necessary sign of interpolation or compilation. To assume either of these principles from the data before us would be hasty and illogical; both too will be found to be contradicted in the clearest manner by the evidence deducible from other portions of the sacred writings. Thus, it is one of the most prominent of Bishop Colenso's arguments in reference to the date of these different sections of Genesis, that the Psalms composed by David in his earlier years are Elohistic, while those written in his later years are Jehovistic; where the unity of authorship of these diverse Psalms is an essential point in the argument. Again it were easy to shew that a similar dissecting process to that

* This is supposing the whole of the last four books to be taken into account. If the disputed passages noted above be omitted, the proportion would be as 42 to 1.

applied to Genesis might be used also with respect to other historical books of the Old Testament, whose integrity has passed unquestioned.* Nay, that the same might be extended to the New Testament also, and grave doubts be thrown upon the genuineness of some of the most undoubted of St. Paul's Epistles, if a difference of usage in such matters were to be accounted a decisive sign of diversity of authorship.† If the book of Genesis, then, stood alone, the occurrence of such abrupt transitions from one name to the other would be of little value as an argument for compilation, but would rather be regarded as a literary curiosity characteristic of the author. This, however, is not the case. We have a great variety of other writings all ascribed to the same author as Genesis, writings many of them in every way parallel to the ones in question, yet none of which present us with anything even approaching to the phenomena existing there. If it appeared even, that Elohim was a common word with Moses, and used by him sometimes for several verses together, though less

* Take, for example, chap.iv.-vi. of the first book of Samuel, where both names will be found occurring in alternate sections, which may hence be readily classified as Elohistic or Jehovistic, and which are not unlike *some* of those suggested by modern critics in the Pentateuch. Thus iv.1-6 contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim once; iv.7-22 contains Elohim 10 times, Jehovah not once; v.1-2,10-2 contain Elohim 5 times, Jehovah not once; v.3-9 contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim not once; while chap.vi. contains Jehovah 13 times, Elohim not once. The same might be said of chap. x., where *v.*1,6,17-25 are Jehovistic (J.9,E.1), and *v.*3-5,7-10,26, are Elohistic (E.6,J.0). Or again we might select the book of Daniel as an example; chap.ix. of which is Jehovistic (J.10,E.0), while the rest of the book is decidedly Elohistic (E.7,J.0). And other instances of the same kind might easily be found.

† In the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul uses the name Jesus 5 times, Christ 33 times; in the two to the Corinthians, Jesus 16 times, Christ 77 times; in Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, Jesus 4 times, Christ 87 times; in the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, Jesus twice, Christ 4 times; in all, Jesus 27 times, Christ 201 times, or nearly 8 times as often. In the two epistles to the Thessalonians, however, (whose genuineness has been defended by such critics as De Wette, Meyer, and Jowett) we find precisely the *reverse* usage, Jesus 13 times, Christ 4 times; a conclusive proof no doubt of diverse authorship.

frequently on the whole than Jehovah, it might be supposed that in Genesis we had merely some exaggerated instances of the same thing. But on the contrary it has been shewn, that Elohim is really a very *rare* word in the rest of the Pentateuch; rarest, too, in just those very parts which we have most reason to ascribe to him. It is certainly hard to see how such facts can be reconciled with the Mosaic authorship of those sections of Genesis where Elohim is the characteristic name. Notwithstanding the attempt has been made, and that by some of no mean reputation for scholarship.

The ground commonly taken to this end is a certain supposed difference in the character of the two names, which would make one more appropriate than the other, according to the feelings or sentiments of those who used them. Jehovah is said to be the more exalted, the more spiritual, the more divine name, and used therefore when the religious feelings were most warmly excited, and the highest view of God's person and attributes was vividly before the speaker's mind. Elohim, on the contrary, is said to be a lower, more general, and common name, which might be used on all occasions, and with reference to the ordinary affairs of life. The one, in fact, is characterized as the special, personal, spiritual name of God; the other as the general, providential, secular name. These fine-drawn distinctions sound very well in theory, and may be perhaps in some respects correct *theoretically*, but to ascribe to them the curious phenomena of Genesis is simply absurd. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the appropriate feelings which are to account for the speaker's choice have first to be assumed, *in consequence* of his having chosen as he did, and the whole argument becomes mere reasoning in a circle. Let any one carefully examine the attempts of Hengstenberg (quoted by Bishop Colenso, Pt.II.,p.181-4) to explain on this principle the varying usage of the two names in Gen.xxviii.-xxxi, and compare his statements with the original narrative, on which they are supposed to be based, and the utter groundlessness

of the whole theory will be at once apparent. But further, not only does this scheme of reconciliation require a large amount of arbitrary and unwarranted assumption to make it even plausible, but it is often directly opposed to the plain facts of the case. Take a few examples by way of illustration. In Gen.i.26-7, and ii.7, we have two accounts of the creation of man, the first regarding him in his relation to God, as made in His image, the second in his relation to the earth, as created out of the dust. Which of these now should have the more special, personal, and spiritual name of God? Surely the *first*. Yet on turning to the passages we find that man's creation in the divine image is spoken of as the act of *Elohim*, his creation out of the dust as the act of *Jehovah* Elohim. In Gen.xvii.1 it is said that '*Jehovah* appeared unto Abram'; throughout the rest of the chapter every act of God is described as done by Elohim. Is it to be supposed, then, that this *appearing* was something more special, personal, and spiritual than his subsequent *speaking* to him (*v.*3,9,15,19), or *departing* from him (*v.*22)? Or, again, is it to be supposed that the destruction of Sodom, and remembering of Abraham, spoken of in Gen.xix.29, where Elohim is used, were less worthy of ascription to the exalted, covenant God, than the sending of the two angels, or the raining down fire from heaven, spoken of in *v.*13,24, where Jehovah is used? Or, yet once more, can we perceive the slightest reason why the ordinary events of every-day life should in Gen.xlv. be ascribed to Elohim, and in xxxix. to Jehovah; any reason why Jacob in his most exalted spiritual emotions should use Elohim (xlviii.3,15-6,21), while in asking for hire from Laban he used Jehovah (xxx.27-30)? But leaving such special inconsistencies (of which many more might easily be cited) out of the question, it cannot but strike one as most extraordinary, not to say incredible, that the requirements of the narrative in Genesis should change so frequently, and yet often remain fixed for so long together, as would be implied by the occurrence of the two names in alternating and lengthy sections;

that the names should so seldom be intermixed; above all, that while the lower and less honourable name had been so frequently required in the *earlier* narrative, it was needed so seldom in the *later*,—not once in all the minutiæ of the Levitical laws, thrice only in the narrative of Numbers, but twice in the closing addresses of Deuteronomy. Are we to assume, that throughout the whole of this legislation, in every recorded circumstance of that chequered history, the feelings of the speakers and actors were ever strained to that pitch of religious enthusiasm, which would compel them to use the *higher*, *holier* name which proverb had associated with the hunter Nimrod (Gen.x.9), and lead them to reject that *lower* and more *earthly* name wherewith Isaac had blessed Jacob (xxviii.1-4), and Jacob Joseph (xlviii.15-6), and Joseph the children of Israel (l.24-5)? But we refrain. To raise a smile on a subject so sacred as the name of God,—that be far from us. Yet are these extravagant and absurd positions really the inevitable conclusions, to which the adoption of this mode of reconciliation would lead us; since it is clear that if the principle be true, and capable of adequately explaining the usage of Genesis, it should certainly be equally true and equally adequate when applied to the other portions of the Pentateuch.

Rejecting, then, this scheme of reconciliation as hopelessly untenable, we proceed to examine briefly another, which though less known, may yet occur to some readers' minds as possible. May not the Elohistic passages have been written by Moses at a different *time* to the rest of the Pentateuch, in the same way that David at one time wrote Elohistic Psalms, and at another Jehovistic? A plausible idea, certainly, and one which would be well worthy of consideration were the phenomena to be solved different from what they are. If the *whole* book of Genesis were Elohistic, the supposition that Moses wrote it would be far less improbable than it now appears; the Psalms of David would furnish a sufficient parallel. Or if there were only a very few perfectly distinct and unconnected narratives which bore the Elohistic

stamp, these might not unreasonably be regarded as earlier compositions. But to suppose (as we must) that Moses wrote a complete history of patriarchal times in his early days, and then afterwards, finding it imperfect, supplemented it with numerous passages of various length, differing remarkably from his original work in their usage of the divine names; interspersing these among his original matter, apparently insensible to the incongruities arising thereby; altering his former-usage, indeed, here and there, but leaving it for the most part untouched, contrary as it now was to all his tastes and feelings,—to suppose this, would be a strain upon our credulity, indeed. A later writer, who desired to render his history as accurate as possible by the retention, wherever practicable, of the identical words of the documents on which it was based, might, not improbably, treat them in this way. But that any author should pay this respect to his own writings, composed in a different, and now in his eyes *faulty* style, is a supposition most improbable. One, certainly, quite unwarranted by the weak presumption of Mosaic authorship furnished by tradition, and here the only ground we have for assuming it.

There remains now but one other explanation to be considered, whose incompatibility with the facts of the case is so obvious, that it needs but to be stated to refute itself. It is that Moses abstained from using the name Jehovah in certain passages from feeling it to be inappropriate to the times of which he wrote, as being itself of later date (see chap.vi.). But if so, then clearly he would have abstained from it throughout, and not merely in certain parts. He has not done so; the Elohistic and Jehovistic sections run side by side through the entire book, and hence the idea of a purposed omission of Jehovah on this account, by a common writer, is absolutely inconceivable. If Moses wrote the Elohistic sections with this idea in view, then it is clear that another hand must have added the Jehovistic.

No sufficient explanation of the phenomena in Genesis being

thus discoverable on the hypothesis of common Mosaic authorship, we resume our examination of the compilation theory. It is certainly the most feasible solution of the difficulty that has appeared; is it, however, sufficiently so to warrant us in adopting it, or shall we rather leave the difficulty unsolved and insoluble? To determine this point we shall now proceed to consider (1) the confirmatory evidence advanced by its supporters, and (2) the various objections to which it is open, and their importance.

Besides the names Jehovah and Elohim, there are three others on whose presence considerable stress is laid in distinguishing the different sections from each other. They are 'El Shaddai' (God Almighty), 'Padan-aram,' and 'Israel' as the *personal* name of the patriarch; all, it is said, peculiar to the Elohist. The following summary of the passages where they occur will put the case clearly before us.

El Shaddai occurs in Gen.xvii.1,xxviii.3,xxxv.11,xliii.14,xlviii.3,xlix.25 (without El), all Elohistic passages. It is found besides in the Pentateuch only in Ex.vi.3, and Nu.xxiv.4,16 (without El), the latter being one of the doubtful passages, excepted above (p. 13), the former merely speaking *of* the name as used by the Patriarchs, not directly using it.

Padan-aram occurs in Gen.xxv.20,xxviii.2,5,6,7,xxxi.18,xxxv.9,26,xlvi.15, xlviii.7, all Elohistic passages. It is found nowhere else in the Bible; the Jehovist writer always using either Mesopotamia (Gen xxiv.10,Dt.xxiii.4), or else Haran (Gen.xii.4,5,xxvii.43,xxviii.10,xxix.4), the former of which is never employed by the Elohist, the latter only twice (xi.31,32).

Israel, as the personal name of the patriarch, occurs in Gen.xxxv.10,21, 22,xxxvii.3,13,xlii.5,xliii.6,8,11,xlv.28, xlvi.1, 2,29,30,xlvii. 29,31,xlviii.2,8,10, 11,13,14,21,xlix.2,1.2, all Elohistic passages. It is never so used by the Jehovist.*

These additional peculiarities of the Elohistic sections certainly tend to confirm the presumption of diverse origin. The great

* Little or no stress can be laid upon this last mark of difference, in as much as there are scarcely any Jehovistic sections subsequent to his change of name, which mention Jacob at all. None, certainly, sufficient to warrant us in concluding 'Israel' to be foreign to the Jehovist's style. Its use by the Elohist is also far from exclusive.

test, however, has yet to be applied. If the book of Genesis be thus composed of portions of an older narrative, incorporated more or less intimately with one of later date, we might reasonably expect that the *subject-matter* of the book would present marks of divergence, as well as the phraseology; that in some cases also the transition from one to the other would be so apparent, as to render any reference to the use of the divine names almost unnecessary. The absence of such divergencies in subject-matter, or signs of transition, would certainly be a serious objection to the compilation theory; their presence the most conclusive confirmatory evidence conceivable. To determine these points will necessitate a detailed examination of the sections already enumerated; and to this we now proceed to apply ourselves.

(1.) The first group of passages to be considered is from Gen. i. to v., the history of the antediluvian world. This we divided above into 3 sections, 2 Elohistic (i.-ii.4,v.), and 1 Jehovistic (ii.4-iv.). We have now to consider what further marks of distinction or division (if any) are to be found in them, besides their use of the two names, which may furnish reasonable grounds for this arrangement. The symmetry and almost dramatic beauty of the opening narrative of Creation are too self-evident to require comment. The progressive creative acts of the six epochs (shadowed forth by six successive days) are detailed in order, each morning ushering in a higher state than the preceding, each evening closing on a fairer and more glorious scene than had hitherto appeared. From the first dawn of Light upon the troubled waters of primeval earth, through all the varied forms of vegetable and animal life, whose remains Geology has so wondrously revealed to us, the work had gone on, increasing in wonder and glory at every step; until at length, towards the close of the last grand period of creative energy, the greatest wonder, the masterpiece of God's Almighty hand, the destined lord of all, was brought upon the scene. And God said, 'We will make man (Heb. 'Adam') in our image, after our likeness, and they shall have dominion

over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heaven, and over the beasts, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing upon the earth. So God created man in his image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them,' (i.26-7). Once more he viewed with his all-seeing eye the universe which he had made, 'and behold it was very good.' Once more there was a pause in the work of creation, 'evening came, and morning came' (*v.*31), and the sixth day was at an end. But the morning of the new epoch rose not to disclose fresh forms of life, fresh wonders of creation, like those preceding; it rose to usher in a period of *rest*. 'The heavens and the earth were finished,' and so God 'rested on the seventh day from all his work' (ii.1-2). Having thus brought his narrative to its natural conclusion, the writer also rests, and closes his record of creation with the emphatic words, 'These are the annals* of the heavens and the earth when they were created' (*v.*4).†

And now an entirely new narrative begins, having respect to the creation of man, indeed, like the preceding, but regarding it from quite a different point of view. There we had the history of the universe, and the creation of man merely introduced in a general way, in respect of his position in that universe. Here, the history of the individual man first formed, his origin, his dwelling-place, his companion, his occupation, his innocence, his fall and destined fate. It is scarcely possible to conceive two records of more diverse character and objects, yet concerned with

* Hebrew תּוֹלְדוֹת rendered in E.V. 'generations'; by Benisch generally 'progeny' sometimes 'generations'; by De Wette 'history.' The word is plural, and is said by Gesenius to mean either 1. Families, generations,—a family register; 2. A family history; 3. A history in a more extensive sense. The nearest English equivalent is perhaps 'annals' as above.

† The punctuation here followed is that of De Wette. The words are generally regarded as part of the following sentence, 'At the time (lit. 'in the day') that God Jehovah made the earth and the heavens,' &c. (so Benisch and E.V.); but the other seems the preferable reading. Both Benisch and De Wette place them, however, at the commencement of the next section, instead of at the end of the former as above. The reasons for this alteration will be given further on (see p.27).

the same events; nor can we wonder that there should be many differences or even apparent contradictions between them, arising from the different stand-points of their respective authors. One such, concerning the origin of man, we have already had occasion to notice (p.17); the Elohist representing him as made 'in the image of God,' the Jehovist as formed 'of the dust of the ground.' A difference certainly strange and improbable had the two sections constituted one continuous narrative proceeding from the same author; but natural and reasonable enough if they are regarded as distinct. The first writer, viewing the creation of man as the completion of God's work upon earth, naturally laid most stress upon that feature in his creation, in which he differed from and surpassed all those other beings of which he had just been speaking. At the same time clearly indicating by the name Adam (= the *ground*), the earthly origin which man shared in common with the brutes. The second writer, viewing Adam's creation merely as the first stage of his individual existence, as naturally laid stress upon the material out of which his visible body was created, especially as his narrative would lead him shortly afterwards to speak of man's return to dust again as the penalty of his sin (iii.19). Yet does he not by any means overlook the diviner part of man's nature, since he distinctly records, that God Jehovah 'breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul' (ii.7). It is in *form*, therefore, not in *substance* that their narratives differ. In the same way, the Elohist makes no mention of the special dwelling-place prepared for Adam, but regards him rather in his destined office of Lord of the whole earth; while the Jehovist describes the situation and character of the garden of Eden at length. So, too, the Elohist, regarding man as the ruling nature of the earth, tells us simply that God created man 'male and female'; while the Jehovist, having respect to the individuals concerned, records the special circumstances connected with the creation of Eve, to notice which would

have been foreign to the Elohist's purpose, as well as destructive to the symmetry of his narrative. All these differences between the two records we candidly admit, and agree with Bishop Colenso in regarding them as evidences of diverse authorship, though certainly not as contradictions. The others which he has noticed are not so happy, and arise from a somewhat serious misunderstanding of the meaning of the Elohist's record.

The creation of birds and beasts is stated in Gen.i. to have *preceded* that of man, a fact fully borne out by the discoveries of Geology; in Gen.ii., however, their creation is spoken of *after* that of Adam, but before that of Eve. Of course this seeming contradiction would be easily got over by supposing (as we reasonably might), that they are mentioned here because the subject required it, although in existence before. This explanation, however, though sufficient to destroy the force of the objection, and in great measure no doubt correct, yet fails to vindicate the consistency of the two narratives with fact, so clearly and convincingly as may be done in another way. If our view of the first record of creation be correct, and the six days be regarded as representatives of six great epochs of creative energy,—whereby its agreement with the discoveries of Geology is established, and much valuable light thrown on the meaning of its details,*—if this be so, then it follows that the creation of birds and creeping things on the fifth day, and of four-footed beasts on the sixth, does not mean that at these particular periods *all* the species of birds and reptiles and quadrupeds were created, which have ever lived upon our globe, but rather that these particular kinds of animals formed the *chief and distinguishing features* of those periods. There may have been birds created before the fifth day, others also on the sixth; just as there were doubtless fresh plants created after the third day. All that is intended by the narrative is, we apprehend, to set forth the special characteristics of each succeed-

* See on this point the able statements and arguments of the Geologist, Hugh Miller. 'Testimony of the Rocks,' Lect.iii.-iv.

ing epoch, not to define precisely *all* that was created on each day. Now it is a well known fact in Geology, that but very few of the plants and animals especially needed or employed by man can be traced back to periods prior to the date of his creation. The subordinate members of each epoch were suited to the superior; when, therefore, man appeared on the scene, it was but natural that with him should appear also those creatures most suited to his needs. These, then, may be regarded as the contemporaries of man, created for him and with him; and these no doubt it is, that are spoken of as brought by God unto Adam, that he should see if there were any whom he could take for his companion (Gen.ii.18-20), to whom also he gave names. But if so, then they must be regarded as entirely distinct from those birds and beasts named in the Elohist's narrative as characteristic of the fifth and earlier portion of the sixth days, and all possibility of contradiction is at once removed.* The same principle will explain the meaning of the curious statement with which the Jehovistic record opens. 'At the time when God Jehovah made the earth and the heaven, then every plant of the field was not yet in the earth, and every herb of the field had not yet grown; for God Jehovah had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and there was no man to till the ground. But there went up a mist from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground' (ii.4-6). Regarding these words as referring to the plants named in i.11-2, and all would be contradiction and confusion; regarding them, however, as referring to those particular plants which were created for the use of man, at the time of his appearance upon the earth, and all is plain and natural. *These* plants were not as yet, for they required rain and culture for their growth, neither of which

* Bishop Colenso's objection, that the 'fowls' are said to have been created in the first place from the *waters* (i.20-1) and then afterwards from the *ground* (ii.19) is of course readily solved in this way. The birds and reptiles which characterized the 5th period were (as Geology plainly shews us) for the most part *aquatic*, those that were intended for man's use belonged for the most part to the *land*.

had been as yet bestowed. And there is a peculiarity about the phraseology used in describing the plants here, as also the animals in ii.19, which strikingly confirms this view of them. They are spoken of as the 'plants of the *field*,' 'herbs of the *field*,' animals of the *field*,' a phrase nowhere employed by the Elohist (comp.i. 30, where they are called animals of the *earth*), but which would clearly be very appropriate, if the plants and animals thus spoken of were, as we have supposed, those created for man's service in the fields which he should cultivate or keep for his own use.*

Carefully considered, then, we cannot regard these two narratives as in any point contradictory to each other. Remarkable differences there certainly are, which may be fairly urged as proofs of diverse authorship, but none which are not capable of a simple and reasonable explanation, if only the proper character and objects of each, and the true meaning of the first as viewed in the light of modern Science, be carefully borne in mind.† We have dwelt the longer upon these two sections of Genesis, both because of their intrinsic importance and the many difficulties which they are thought to present, and also more especially because they afford us almost the only instance where the same

* The only discrepancy between the two narratives urged by Bishop Colenso not alluded to above, is that between i.9-10, where the land is said to have emerged from the waters, and must therefore (says Bishop Colenso) have been 'saturated with moisture,' and ii.6, where the necessity of moistening the ground is spoken of. This objection is, however, at once dispelled, when we recollect that the first statement concerns a period probably many ages anterior to that spoken of in the second. During the interval between the first appearance of land and the creation of Adam, every portion of the sea and land had probably changed places several times, the ground become 'saturated' and 'dry' alternately over and over again.

† The reasons for adopting the view of the six days here advocated are of course almost wholly deduced from Geology, and will be found fully discussed in the work of Hugh Miller already referred to (p.24 note); to enter into their merits here would be out of place. It may be well, however, to remark that the only objection which can be urged against it—the word 'day,'—is founded on a misconception. The Hebrew יוֹם, like its Greek equivalent ἡμερα, being constantly used of any vague or *undefined* period or season, as well as of the ordinary day of 24 hours.

subject is found treated of both in Elohistic and Jehovistic sections, and where therefore a safer and more conclusive comparison can be made than in other cases. The result of this comparison has been already stated, as being decidedly adverse to the traditionary notion of common authorship, and strongly confirmatory of that diverse origin which the different usage of the divine names first led us to suspect. It remains now to examine into the *connection* between these two sections and the next.

The sudden change of aspect and style which characterizes the transition from Gen.i-ii.4 to ii.4.-iv. has been already fully considered, we have now only to point out two lesser marks of phraseology, which serve to determine the exact point where one narrative ends and the other begins. 1. The expression, 'These are the annals &c.' is one peculiar to the Elohist, and which generally occurs either at the beginning or the end of each of his sections, as we shall shew hereafter. 2. The phrase 'the heavens and the earth' in the beginning of ii.4, is exactly parallel with Gen.i.1. and ii.1.; at the end of ii.4 on the contrary, after the first mention of Jehovah, we have 'the earth and the heavens.' It is scarcely likely that the same writer, who had thrice employed the words in one order, should thus suddenly reverse them. On these two grounds, coupled with the position of the name Jehovah, and the natural connection of the first part of ii.4 with the preceding section, we are disposed to make the division as suggested below, in the middle of the verse, at the word 'created.' The other transition, from chap.iv to v. is still more clearly defined, and strikingly confirmatory of the compilation theory. The last events recorded in chap.iv. are the birth of Seth and Enos; with these also chap.v. begins, so that the same things are narrated twice over, apparently without purpose. Nor is this all, the opening of chap.v. is very remarkable,—'This is the book of the annals of Adam.' How natural a commencement after the closing words of the first section—'These are the annals of the heavens and the earth,'—the same word (תּוֹלְדוֹת) being used in

each. How unnatural after the lengthy narrative of Adam's history and descendants immediately preceding. And then what follows? 'At the time (lit. 'in the day') when God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, at the time when they were created.' A striking reminiscence of i.26-8, for which a parallel is sought in vain throughout the intervening chapters. Other characteristics tending the same way might easily be pointed out, but enough has been said, we trust, to establish the fact of a clear well-marked transition being discernible between these two chapters.*

(2.) The next group of passages which will demand our attention is that from Gen.vi. to xi.27, the history of the world from Noah to Abram. This we divided above into 10 sections, 4 Elohistic (vi.9-22,vii.6-viii.19,ix.1-19,28-9,xi.10-27), 5 Jehovistic (vi.1-8,vii.1-5,viii.20-2,ix.20-7,xi.1-9), and one doubtful (x.). As these form one continuous narrative, we have less opportunity for comparison than in the preceding, and cannot therefore expect to find so many clear marks of difference. The following may however be noticed as occurring in the account of the deluge, which consists of alternate Elohistic and Jehovistic sections. 1. The Elohistic sections contain the phrases 'fowls *after their kind*,' 'beasts *after their kind*,' &c., (vi.20,vii.14) as in the Elohist account of creation (i.11,12,21,24,25); also 'walked with God' (vi.9,comp.v.22,24); 'in the image of God' (ix.6); which are not to be found in the Jehovistic portions. 2. The Elohist uses the phrase זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה for 'male and female' (vi.19, vii.9,16) as in i.27,v.2; the Jehovist twice uses אִישׁ וְאִשְׁתּוֹ, which is literally 'man and wife' (vii.2,2), and the other phrase only once (vii.3). 3. The Elohist speaks of all living things being

* The opening phrase of chap.v. 'In the day that God created man,' was very probably the occasion of the parallel phrase at the commencement of the Jehovistic section ii.4-iv. The later writer, seeing these words in the document before him, having involuntarily adopted them for the commencement of his own portion.

'destroyed' (lit. 'corrupted' שָׁחַת) from off the earth (vi.13,17, ix.11,15,comp.vi.11,12); the Jehovist of their being 'blotted out,' מָחָה (vi.7,vii.4,23,).* 4. The Elohist (vi.19-20) says that the animals were brought into the ark by pairs; the Jehovist, that the unclean were by pairs, but the clean by *sevens* (vii. 2,3), that is probably seven pairs of each. This last difference seems, indeed, to amount to a direct contradiction. As, however, it is clear from the Elohist's narrative that the distinction between clean and unclean animals was in some way observed (vii.8), and as it was certainly true in a *general* sense that the animals came by pairs, though some few came by seven pairs, we should scarcely be justified in rejecting either record on account of this discrepancy.† As a proof of independent authorship, however, it is very important. It is curious also to notice, that almost all those fine details of dates, which characterize the narrative of the deluge, are to be found in the Elohistic sections, as also all the information respecting the size of the ark; facts which have an important bearing upon some points to be discussed hereafter (see chap.vi.). The transitions from one section to another present no difficulty in any case, while in several they are clearly marked. Thus the first Elohistic section opens with the phrase

---

* This last verse appears at first sight to be part of the Elohist's narrative, it is really, however, nothing but a repetition in other words of *v.*21-22, and may therefore not improbably be an addition of the Jehovist.

† Similar instances of more or less exact accounts of the same occurrence giving rise to the appearance of contradiction are to be found in the Gospels. Thus in Matthew it is said that *two* blind men sat by the way side at Jericho and cried after Jesus, in Mark and Luke only *one* is mentioned. In Mark, again, it is said that the cock crew once during Peter's denials, once afterwards, the words of our Saviour being 'the cock shall not crow *twice*, ere thou deny me thrice'; in the other three Evangelists only the last cock-crowing is mentioned, the words of our Saviour being reported as 'the cock shall *not crow* ere thou deny me thrice.' It is clear that in such cases one narrative must be regarded as more exact and reliable than the other; yet to dispute the authenticity of the gospel history on the ground of such little discrepancies would be absurd. They rather serve to establish it, by demonstrating the perfect independence of the four chief witnesses to it.

already commented on, 'These are the annals of Noah' (vi.9), which reads curiously after the preceding statement, that 'Noah found favour in the eyes of Jehovah' (*v.*8), but which naturally introduces the detailed account of the building of the ark and the history of the deluge about to be given. Verses 11-2, too, are really nothing but a briefer statement of that which has been far more fully detailed in *v.*1-7, only in different phraseology; very natural from an independent writer, but very unlikely from the same one who had already composed the previous part. The repetition of the command to take animals into the ark (vii.1-5), directly after the statement that Noah had done 'according to all that God commanded him' (vi.22, which included the provision for the animals, *v.*19-21), is also unlikely in a continuous narrative, though natural in a compilation, where the later writer had a new point (the clean beasts by sevens), overlooked by his predecessor, to introduce. But perhaps the strongest proof of the entire independence of the Elohistic narrative is to be found in the fact, that it can be read through by itself, omitting all the Jehovistic additions, without the slightest break or flaw occurring anywhere, without the slightest sign of anything being left out. That this should be so, if the Elohist's were really the original story, supplemented by additions from a later hand, is reasonable enough. But that there should be in a continuous history three distinct passages of various lengths, all characterized by remarkable differences from the rest of the narrative, possessing so little connection with their immediate context that they could be omitted without any flaw being perceptible, would certainly be a very curious and extraordinary phenomenon.

The episodes concerning the misconduct and curse of Canaan (ix.20-7), and the confusion of tongues (xi.1-9), are so distinct from the surrounding narrative, that their ascription to the Jehovist in like manner leaves the original document without any apparent flaw. The remaining sections (x.,xi.10-26,27-32) are all characterized by the opening phrase, 'These are the annals,'

and are therefore most naturally ascribed to the Elohist, though the all but total absence of the divine names in them (Jehovah is found twice in x.9) renders this somewhat doubtful, as does also the occurrence of 'Haran' in xi.31,32, a name elsewhere peculiar to the Jehovist. Still, on the whole, we should prefer to regard them as Elohistic records, reserving the difficulties presented by the occurrence of Jehovah in one of them for a later part of the chapter.

(3.) In the two groups of passages already considered the Elohistic sections have formed the larger part, and have appeared to constitute the groundwork of the entire narrative, supplemented at times by important additions of the Jehovist. In that which we are now about to enter upon (Gen.xii.-xxv.11, the history of Abraham) the contrary appears at first sight to be the case, the main features of the story being found in the Jehovistic sections. This can only be accounted for by supposing that the later writer has here *omitted* certain parts of the Elohist's narrative, and replaced them by his own, instead of merely adding fresh matter as before. A supposition that derives considerable support from the fact, that we search in vain for the characteristic Elohist phrase 'These are the annals' as applied to Abraham. We have found already the 'annals' of the 'heavens and the earth,' of 'Adam,' of 'Noah,' of 'the sons of Noah,' of 'Shem,' of 'Terah;' and we shall have occasion to notice hereafter the 'annals' of 'Ishmael,' of 'Isaac,' of 'Esau,' and of 'Jacob'; only Abraham is wanting. That the earlier annalist should have omitted to write an account of this most notable character in patriarchal times, or should have failed to adopt the same mode of beginning for *his* history as he did without exception for the others, is most improbable. That he should have commenced his record with chap.xvii. (the earliest section which we have any reason to ascribe to him), and so have neglected to make any mention of the call of Abraham or birth of Ishmael, is also most improbable. The conclusion, then, seems forced upon us, that we have not here

all the Elohistic narrative originally in existence, but only such parts as the Jehovist thought proper to preserve. This fact must be carefully borne in mind in the discussion of the groups of passages yet to be considered.

That immediately before us we divided above into 10 sections. 5 Jehovistic (xii.-iii.,xv.-vi.,xviii.-ix.,xxii.11-19,xxiv.), 4 Elohistic (xvii.,xx.-xxii.10,xxii.20-xxiii.,xxv.1-11), and 1 doubtful (xiv.). The only noteworthy difference between these sections is the absence from the Elohistic of all allusion to the blessing of Abraham, which we certainly might have expected in chap.xvii., where the institution of circumcision is narrated. No stress can, however, be laid upon this, in as much as there are also Jehovistic passages where it is wanting (xiii.,xv.), and moreover it *is* alluded to in a later Elohistic section (xxviii.3-4). So far then as subject-matter is concerned, no divergence can be perceived between the alternate sections of this group. Nor do the points of transition from one to another present any additional evidence in favour of diverse origin; in fact in one case there is a decided difficulty, which may be fairly urged by way of objection. It occurs in the account of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, half of which is Elohistic and half Jehovistic, while the narrative throughout is so continuous that neither portion is complete without the other. We can only suppose, that for some reason or other the latter part of the Elohistic record was omitted, and the thread of the story taken up by the Jehovist. A supposition by no means improbable, when we remember the reasons for believing some omissions to have been made, already adduced. Still, so far as this particular case is concerned, we have no ground beyond the usage of the two names, on which to base the assumption. All the other transitions are easy and natural, though not by any means more strongly marked than those from one portion to another of the same narrative. The doubtful section (xiv.) will be considered at length hereafter, when the general signs of time come under discussion; it differs remarkably from the surrounding sections.

(4.) The next group of passages to be considered is from Gen.xxv.12, to xxxvii.2, the histories of Ishmael, Isaac, Esau, and Jacob. This we divided above into 5 sections, 3 Elohistic (xxv.12-20,xxviii.1-9,xxxi.4-xxxvii.2), and 2 Jehovistic (xxv.21-xxvii.,xxviii.10-xxxi.3). The continuity of the narrative as before prevents the occurrence of any divergences in subject-matter, and we are left to the minor indications of transition arising from phraseology. The expression, 'These are the annals,' occurs five times in these sections, in xxv.12 before the account of Ishmael and his descendants, in xxv.19 before the history of Isaac, in xxxvi.1,9, before the account of Esau and his descendants, first in Canaan and then afterwards in Edom, and in xxxvii.2 at the close of the history of Jacob.* We should therefore regard all the passages connected with these as Elohistic, and in every instance but one this is natural and easy. The case of Isaac, however, presents a difficulty. The passage runs thus:—'And these are the annals of Isaac, Abraham's son. Abraham begat Isaac; and Isaac was forty years old when he took Rebekah to wife, the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian of Padan-aram, the sister to Laban the Syrian' (xxv.20). So far all is consistent enough, and the mention of 'Padan-aram' confirms the Elohistic character of the section. From the next verse and onwards, however, all is Jehovistic. This is certainly one of the most formidable incongruities to be found in the book of Genesis, and again we are obliged to have recourse to the supposition, that the remainder of the Elohist's narrative has been for some reason omitted, and replaced by Jehovistic matter. None of the other transitions present independent tokens of compilation, and two of

* This last instance of the phrase is somewhat exceptional, since it follows the matter concerned instead of preceding it. That this is its connection seems plain however, since the next events referred to have to do with Joseph rather than with Jacob; Gen.ii.4 also furnishes a parallel. These opening verses of chap. xxxvii. are best read at the end of xxxv., when they form the natural conclusion to the account of Jacob's journeyings recorded in the eight preceding chapters.

them are certainly rather arbitrary, there being no apparent break in the narrative (xxvii.-viii.,xxxi.3-4). In one of these, however, (xxxi.3-4) the *mixed* character of the preceding section (see p.9-10) may be thought to account for this, and the transition be regarded merely as a cessation from Jehovistic additions and corrections, rather than the beginning of an entirely new section. The other (xxvii.-viii.) may be ascribed with some show of reason to the omission of part of the Elohist's narrative already noticed. Still it must be borne in mind, that all these explanations, however sufficient, are purely conjectural, and the difficulties which necessitate them must still be regarded as objections (albeit somewhat mitigated) to the theory of compilation.

(5.) The last group of passages, which remains for consideration, is that from Gen.xxxvii. to l., the history of Joseph, with the episode in xxxviii. concerning Judah. This we divided above into 4 sections, 2 Elohistic (xxxvii.,xlii.5-l.), and 2 Jehovistic (xxxviii.,xxxix.-xlii.4). The transitions here are clear and well-defined; the first two arising naturally and inevitably from the insertion of the narrative in chap.xxxviii. in the midst of the history of Joseph; while the second is further confirmed by the reiteration in the opening verse of chap.xxxix. of the sale of Joseph to Potiphar, already recorded in the closing verse of xxxvii., only in different words. This might however have occurred, merely on account of the interruption in the narrative noticed above, as the most natural means of resuming it, so that it must not be looked upon as a decisive argument for compilation. But it is the third and last transition which is more especially worthy of note, introducing as it does one of the longest and most remarkable Elohistic sections in the whole book, and presenting a singularly interesting proof of its diverse origin. The passage runs thus:—"And the famine was over all the face of the earth; and Joseph opened all the [places] that [had food] in them, and sold grain unto the Egyptians; and the famine waxed sore in the land of Egypt. And all the earth came unto

Egypt to Joseph for to buy grain; because the famine was sore in all the earth. And when Jacob saw that there was a sale of corn in Egypt, Jacob said unto his sons, Wherefore do ye look to yourselves? And he said, Behold, I have heard that there is a sale of corn in Egypt; go down thither, and buy grain for us from thence, that we may live, and not die. And Joseph's ten brethren went down to buy corn in Egypt. But Benjamin, Joseph's brother, Jacob sent not with his brethren; for he said, Lest peradventure mischief befall him" (xli.56-xlii.4). All this is plain and straightforward enough, and all due, as is shewn by the preceding matter, to the Jehovist. It will be observed, that the writer has distinctly laid down (1) Joseph's position in Egypt, (2) his selling corn to the people, (3) the extension of the famine to Canaan, and (4) the visit of his ten brethren for the purpose of buying corn. He is ready therefore to proceed at once to their reception by Joseph. Yet strange to say, every one of these four points is again repeated in the two next verses, before this is entered upon. 'And the sons of Israel came to buy grain among those that came; for the famine was in the land of Canaan. And Joseph was the governor over the land, he that sold grain to all the people of the land; and Joseph's brethren came,' &c. (xlii.5-6). Is it likely that any writer would have thus needlessly repeated himself, or have taken such pains to reiterate points on which he had already fully informed his readers only two or three sentences before? Regard these verses, however, as part of a different narrative, which the Jehovist here transcribes verbatim, having replaced the previous portion by his own composition, and all is simple and natural.*

We have now completed our review of the additional evidence concerning the compilation theory, to be deduced from the divergences of subject-matter, and marks of transition between

* If 'Israel' be a characteristic of the Elohist, then the occurrence of this name instead of Jacob in *v.5* is an additional confirmation of the view taken above. But see p.20 note.

the alternate Elohistic and Jehovistic sections; and it cannot but be admitted, that on the whole this evidence is decidedly in its favour. Several clear cases of divergence have been established, chiefly, as might have been expected, in those portions which have to some extent a common subject. Many striking instances have appeared also of distinct and well-defined transition, evidenced sometimes by the subject-matter, more commonly by the phraseology, and especially by the occurrence of the characteristic phrase, 'These are the annals.' On the other hand there are a few instances where the supposed transition from one author to another has rested on bare conjecture, and the narrative would be most naturally regarded as a continuous whole. Many also where the transitions are in no respect more clearly marked than the ordinary transitions from one division to another in the same narrative. These latter, however, cannot be urged as objections to the theory, any more than the absence of divergences in other cases than those enumerated; since the idea of compilation by no means *necessitates* either divergence or well-marked transitions, but merely involves the probability that in *some* cases these will be found, with which the facts before us well agree. The real difficulties which presented themselves have also been shewn to admit of a ready and not unreasonable explanation, on the supposition that certain parts of the Elohistic record were omitted by the Jehovist and replaced by his own matter. A supposition which appeared on other and independent grounds to be certainly probable. Weighed, therefore, one against the other, the evidence for compilation must be allowed to preponderate; and a valuable confirmation to the results deduced from the usage of the divine names is thus obtained. It remains now to examine into the validity of two or three other objections to which the theory in question is fairly open, before we finally conclude as to its tenability and reasonableness.

1. Elohim is not confined to the Elohistic sections, but is to be found not unfrequently in the Jehovistic also, viz., Gen.iii.1,3,5,iv.25,ix.27,xix.29,

xxii.12,xxvii.28,xxxix.9,xl.8,xli.16,25,28,32,38,39,51,52, in all 20 times; besides those in which it is necessary or preferable from the idiom of the language.

Ans. It is never asserted, however, that the Jehovist employs one name to the entire exclusion of the other. Elohim occurs four times in Deuteronomy, 3 times in Numbers, and still oftener in Exodus; all which are decidedly Jehovistic. Its *occasional* occurrence in the Jehovistic parts of Genesis is therefore no more than reasonable. Special reasons may also be given for many of the instances cited; thus the three in Gen.iii. are from the mouth of the Serpent, nine of those in xxxix.-xli. are in conversations with Egyptians, in both which cases the name may have been omitted as inappropriate. Others again may be due to fragments of the fundamental Elohistic records, incorporated by the Jehovist with his own composition; the two in Gen.xix.29, very probably arise from this cause. This objection cannot therefore be allowed any weight in determining the point at issue.

2. The name Jehovah is found not unfrequently in Elohistic sections, viz., Gen. v. 29,vii.16,x.9,xiv.22,xvii.1,xx.18,xxi.1,33,xxxi.49,xxxii.9,xlix.18, in all 13 times.

Ans. This objection might seem at first sight to be as hollow as the first, and explicable on the same ground, of general usage not necessarily involving exclusive usage. It derives its strength, however, from the notion, that these sections are Elohistic because they were written before the revelation of the name Jehovah, which would of course make its presence in them an impossibility. To discuss this point here would be out of place; assuming it however to be even so, is the presence of the name in these places really a fatal objection to the compilation theory? Surely not, for a few alterations and additions by the later writer will abundantly account for them all. And in many cases the passages containing Jehovah are easily separable from the context, so that to regard them as interpolations is by no means unreasonable. The naming of Noah (v.29), in which the curse of the ground is referred to, unmentioned in any Elohistic section extant, and where the form of phraseology used throughout the chapter is markedly departed from; the proverb concerning Nimrod (x.9); the explanatory clause respecting the plague inflicted upon Abimelech's household (xx.18), are striking instances of this. The connection with preceding Jehovistic sections might explain others, as xvii.1,xxxii.9. While the meaning of the name would afford a sufficient inducement for its insertion in yet another, xxi.33. This would leave only 4 cases unaccounted for, in none of which would the idea of alteration or interpolation present the slightest difficulty. We shall have occasion to return to this point hereafter (see chap.vi.).

3. There are some passages where the two names are employed so equally, that it is impossible to determine to which class they belong, viz. xxviii.10-xxxi.3 and xxxix-xlii.4.

Ans. The former of these we have already admitted to be of mixed origin, the latter has been partially explained above. Both may, however, be allowed as difficulties, not by any means incompatible with the idea of compilation, but certainly adverse to it, and more readily explicable on the theory of common undivided authorship.

These objections considered, we are now in a position to draw together all the points of evidence on either side, and form an impartial judgment upon them.

The evidence in favour of Bishop Colenso's view is briefly this:—The book of Genesis is composed of a number of alternating sections of various lengths, distinguished by their different usage of the two names Jehovah and Elohim; a phenomenon unparalleled in the rest of the Pentateuch, and incapable of any sufficient explanation compatible with the common Mosaic authorship of the whole book. These sections present also several remarkable divergences in subject-matter and phraseology, and numerous well-marked and striking signs of transition, confirmatory of the same view, and equally inexplicable on that commonly held.

The counter-evidence in favour of the old established view may be stated as follows:—The distinction of usage depended upon is not absolute, Jehovistic passages contain Elohim, and Elohistic Jehovah, while some obstinately refuse to be classed as either. The divisions proposed are also often arbitrary and ill-defined, made to suit the theory, not grounds on which it rests. To which must be added the presumption afforded by the testimony of tradition.

The weight of evidence unquestionably inclines towards the theory of compilation. And this, not merely an account of the large quantity adduced, or the more general and wide spread character of the facts referred to; important points of advantage as both these are.—It is the logical force of the two positions, which most convincingly proves the strength of the first and the weakness of the second. The evidence in favour of compilation consists of phenonena *inexplicable* on the contrary view. The evidence against it consists merely of phenomena *less easily explicable* on this than on the other view. Grant the theory of compilation to be true, and *all* the peculiarities of Genesis are capable of being adequately accounted for. Grant the theory of undivided Mosaic authorship true, and a few lesser difficulties are

alleviated indeed, but only to be replaced by a vast mass of far larger and insuperable ones. This being so, we at once accept the compilation theory of Genesis as the only reasonable view of its origin before us, still slightly doubtful perhaps, from the amount of assumption it occasionally involves, and the difficulties which still beset it, but certainly far preferable to any other. The application of this theory to the other books of the Pentateuch must be left for a later stage of our inquiries.

CHAPTER III.

THE PROPER NAMES IN THE PENTATEUCH AND HISTORICAL BOOKS.

(Bp. Colenso, Pt. II., Chap. VIII., XIX—XX., p. 234—9, 330—52.)

The concession of Bishop Colenso's view of the constitution of Genesis, necessitated by the evidence considered in the last chapter, must not be regarded as involving the concession of his whole theory as to its origin. That theory rests, as we have already pointed out, upon two perfectly independent propositions, the most important of which has yet to be discussed. It is asserted, not only that the Pentateuch is a compilation (and therefore, in part at least, unmosaic), but that the *date* of each portion can be fixed with some approach to certainty, the most ancient sections being not earlier than the days of Samuel. The evidence on which this assertion is mainly based is certain facts relative to the introduction and use of the name Jehovah, which forms, as we have seen, the great distinguishing mark between the different sections of Genesis. It may be shortly summed up as follows:—

1. If the name Jehovah was in common use among the people in the days of Moses (as the Pentateuch represents it to have been), it would most probably have been used by them in the formation of *proper names*, as Elohim had been before. Instead of this, names compounded with Jehovah are scarcely ever to be met with in the Pentateuch, though those with Elohim are common. Nor can any well-authenticated instance, prior to the days of Samuel, be found in the earlier historical books. During his lifetime, however, they became comparatively common, and afterwards were used for a long period to the almost entire exclusion of those containing Elohim. It is probable, therefore, that the name Jehovah first came into use about the time of

Samuel. Whence it follows, that the bulk of the Pentateuch cannot have been written until some time afterwards, when the name had become familiar.

2. A comparison of the earlier and later Psalms of David presents a similar divergence of usage, in respect to the divine names, to that existing in the book of Genesis. Those which were composed (either by himself or others) in the early part of his life being Elohistic, those composed towards its close Jehovistic. From which we may conclude, that Jehovah was an uncommon name in the first period, but had become well known by the second, exactly in accordance with its supposed origin in the days of Samuel.

3. There are a large number of anachronisms, and other signs of later origin, scattered throughout every portion of the Pentateuch, which point to a period long after that of Moses, as the true date of its composition, and some of which seem especially appropriate to the days of Samuel and David.

These three points of evidence will form the subjects of this and the two following chapters, after which we shall proceed to examine the books' own testimony to the origin of the name Jehovah, and then draw a general conclusion as to the true origin of the first four books.

The special point for our consideration here, then, is the evidence afforded by Hebrew proper names as to the period when the name Jehovah came into common use. The formation of names, both of men and places, in which well-known and familiar names of God shall take a part, has been common in nearly every nation where the freshness and significance of these titles have been felt. A large proportion of the Hebrew names are of this kind; those compounded with Elohim being characterized by an initial or terminal 'El' (אֵל) those with Jehovah by an initial 'Jeho' or 'Jo' (יְהוֹ or יוֹ), or terminal '-jah' (יָהּ or יָהוּ). Occasionally both are found together as in 'Jo-el' and 'Eli-jah.'

But few names formed in this way seem to have been used in early patriarchal times, there being only ten examples to be found out of 180, prior to the birth of Jacob's grandsons. An important fact to be borne in mind, as shewing how little the *absence* of such names can be depended on as a proof of popular ignorance of the name concerned. Elohim, we have every reason to suppose, was the oldest name by which God was known, at least among the

Shemitic nations; yet does it not occur in a single post-diluvian name until nearly 300 years after the separation of the nations, and then not commonly. That is, if the names recorded in Genesis may be taken as a fair and sufficient sample of those employed at the time.* In later times these names compounded with Elohim appear more plentifully, so that in the lists of names given in the book of Numbers they form rather more than one-fourth of the entire number. Only two names compounded with Jehovah are to be found in the Pentateuch. Jo-chebed the mother of Moses; and Jo-shua, whose name was before Hoshea, but was changed by Moses.† These two names are of course very inconvenient to Bishop Colenso's theory, and he therefore assumes that the second name of the great Jewish hero 'certainly originated in an age not earlier than that of Samuel,' though what ground there is for such an assumption it is hard to see; except it be, indeed, his own theory of the origin of the name Jehovah. A theory *supposed* to be built, in part at least, upon these very facts concerning proper names, and yet by which, as by an infallible standard, each of them is first tried, to be accepted as a *proof* of the theory if it agrees with it, to be rejected as 'unhistorical' if it differs from it. In a similar way he disposes of the name Jochebed, remarking on its solitariness as 'in itself a very strong indication that the passages in which it occurs may be interpolations, the product of a later age than that even of the Jehovist.' That the two passages where Jochebed is mentioned (Ex.vi.13-20,Nu.xxvi.58-

* Another illustration of the same fact here insisted on—the length of time which might elapse between the introduction of a divine title and its use in forming proper names,—may be found in the two names Ammi-shaddai and Zuri-shaddai (Nu.i.6,12), which are the only names compounded with 'Shaddai' to be found in the Bible, while yet the title is represented as peculiarly ancient (Ex.vi.2).

† No argument can be founded upon this *change* of name as to the date of the introduction of 'Jehovah,' since the same took place just before the Babylonish captivity, when Pharaoh-nechoh (!) changed the name of Josiah's son from El-iakim to Jeho-iakim (2 Kings xxiii.34). The argument for recent origin would manifestly be as strong in one case as the other.

61) are additions made by a later hand than the original narrator (especially Ex.vi.13-20) is highly probable, as will be seen hereafter (chap.vi.). But that this makes her name unhistorical, or warrants us in rejecting its evidence as unreliable, by no means follows. The same line of argument would lead us to reject Amram, and Kohath, and many other names which are mentioned in the same passages. These however are not Jehovistic names, and so may pass unobjected, Jochebed *is* and therefore must be got rid of.

But passing from these unsupported assumptions, let us just see for a moment what this 'solitariness' really amounts to. Almost all the 70 or 80 persons, whose names are recorded in the narrative of the Exodus, must have been born in Egypt before the mission of Moses.* Supposing now that the name Jehovah was first introduced by him (as many suppose) when he returned from Midian, or had previously existed only among his immediate ancestors (as the name Jochebed would rather seem to imply), and now first became known to the people at large,—then clearly it would be most unreasonable to expect the occurrence of any names compounded with Jehovah among those recorded in the Pentateuch, since these names would have been given *before* the name Jehovah was commonly known. It is evident, therefore, that the fact of there being but two names compounded with Jehovah in the Pentateuch, is in no way inconsistent with the idea that Moses introduced that name to the people at large, or that he wrote the eminently Jehovistic narrative and laws com-

* Of the first two lists (Nu.i.,xiii.) there can be no doubt, as they consist of those who numbered the people, and who went as spies into Canaan (both in the second year of the wanderings), with their respective fathers. Of half the third (Nu.xxxiv.), the fathers of those who were to divide the land, there can equally be no doubt. And it is certainly more probable that the 12 princes themselves should have been selected from those under age at the time of the spies' visit, rather than from those born after the Exodus, especially as they were associated with Caleb, Joshua and Eleazar, all of whom must have been considerably over 20 at the Exodus.

monly ascribed to him. Nay rather, the absence of such names, subsequently so common, and which Moses may very likely have wished to introduce, is, as Bishop Colenso himself admits, 'in itself a strong indication of the truthfulness and historical reality of the record.'

Passing onwards to the book of Joshua we find there but one new name formed from any of the divine titles,—Othni-el. The absence of any Jehovistic names here cannot, therefore, be insisted on as any evidence of the name being unknown, since we have no adequate materials from which to judge.*

In the book of Judges we have no fresh Elohistic names; † four however which are probably Jehovistic, though three are somewhat doubtful, as they are contracted forms and may possibly have been formed in a different way. These are 'Jo-ash' the father of Gideon (Jud.vi.11), 'Jo-tham' his son (ix.5), and Micah (= Mica-iah,xvii.1). Had these occurred in any of the later books, they would doubtless all of them have been regarded as true Jehovistic names, but here they do not suit the theory, and so they are differently formed! But what of the other name, undoubtedly Jehovistic, Jo-nathan the priest of Dan (xviii.30); a name which would carry us back at once to within two generations of Moses;‡

* To make up for this deficiency in names of men, Bishop Colenso has here quoted 12 names of *towns* compounded with Elohim. Before, however, these can be allowed as any argument on his side, it will be necessary for him to shew that names of places were *ever* formed with Jehovah. A fact which it will require all his ingenuity to establish; but without which the argument founded upon these Elohistic names is manifestly worthless.

† The only ones alleged by Bishop Colenso are 'Othniel,' already mentioned in Joshua, and 'Penuel' which being the name of a *place* is irrelevant. See last note.

‡ Jonathan is said to have been the son of Gershom, the son of Moses (altered by the Jews to 'Manasseh' to save the credit of their lawgiver). This, however, Bishop Colenso doubts, 'since' (he says) 'no such name occurs among the sons of Gershom, Nu.iii.18,' and we must therefore suppose him to have been merely 'a descendant of Moses.' It so happens, however, that Nu.iii.18 does not refer to Gershom the son of Moses at all, but to Gershon the son of Levi and grand-uncle of Moses. The descendants of Gershom are nowhere alluded to in the Pentateuch.

—how is this to be got rid of? The method employed is as follows. First, the part of the book of Judges where Jonathan is mentioned is said to be a later addition, dating probably after the days of Samuel; and then secondly, the particular verse where his name occurs is decided to be a still later interpolation, made probably in the reign of Josiah. Now that the last chapters of the book of Judges are from a different hand to the others is by no means improbable; while that they were written after the accession of Saul seems plain from the oft repeated phrase, 'In those days (*i.e.*, those of which the writer is speaking) there was *no king* in Israel' (xvii.6,xviii.1,xix.1,xxi.25). But that xviii.30 is an interpolation made about the time of Josiah is most improbable. The reasons advanced by Bishop Colenso for so regarding it are threefold.

1. One writer would hardly have repeated the statement, that the children of Dan 'set up for themselves the graven image' in two consecutive verses (31,31), as we now find it.

Ans. The first mention of the fact is made for its own sake, as an intrinsic part of the narrative; *v.*28-30, 'And they built a city and abode therein. And they called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father, who was born unto Israel; howbeit the name of the city was Laish at the first. And the children of Dan set them up the graven image; and Jonathan, &c.' The second mention is made merely to introduce a note of time, *v.*31, 'And they set them up Micah's graven image, which he made, *all the time* that the house of God was at Shiloh.' It is difficult to see how the statement of *v.*31 could have been made without the repetition of some part of the preceding.

2. A different word is used for 'set up' in the two verses, that in *v.*30 being the same which is used by the Deuteronomist, but not by the other writers of the Pentateuch, so that this verse is probably due to his hand, and therefore added about the reign of Josiah (see p.7).

Ans. The two words are nowhere else used in the book of Judges, and it is therefore impossible to determine which was most in accordance with the writer's usage, or whether both were. The natural view of the passage would certainly favour the latter idea. The assertion that Deuteronomy was written in the reign of Josiah will be fully discussed hereafter. To assume a distinction between it and the other books of the Pentateuch here is clearly unwarrantable.

3. It is said in *v.*30 that Jonathan and his sons 'were priests to the tribe of Dan until the day of the *captivity of the land*', which may most naturally be interpreted as referring to the captivity under Pekah (2King.xv.29), or else under Hoshea.

Ans. This would require us to suppose, that the worship of the 'graven image' at Dan was continued after there *was* a king in Israel, through the reigns of David and Solomon, of which there is certainly 'no evidence' in any of the later historical books. Nay more, that it went on without interruption side by side with the worship of Jeroboam's golden calf, and so Jonathan's descendants, who were *Levites*, continued to be 'priests to the *tribe of Dan*,' while yet we read it as one of Jeroboam's sins, that the priests he appointed at *Dan* and Bethel were '*not* of the sons of Levi' (1King.xii.30-1).

But why try and guess at the date, when it is clearly fixed by the passage itself? Two notes of time are given, 1. 'until the day of the captivity of the land'; 2. 'all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh.' Surely the most natural and common-sense view of the matter would be to suppose, that these two were identical, and the 'day of captivity' referred to was the same with the destruction of Shiloh alluded to in Jer.vii.12,14, as a warning to Jerusalem (comp. also Ps.lxxviii.60-1). When this destruction took place we have no means of knowing, except that it was somewhere between the death of Eli and the Judgeship of Samuel, a period apparently of 20 years, during which the people were grievously oppressed by the Philistines (1Sam.vii.2-13). It may very likely have been soon after the capture of the ark, with which however it must not be confounded, and which does not seem to be here referred to. Nor is there any clue as to how far this captivity extended, although Bishop Colenso assures us that it is 'very unlikely that the invasion should have reached' so far as Dan, or even if it did, that 'it should have had any effect in stopping the idolatries' there. Neither of these, however, are asserted by the statement in *v.*30. It is never said that the captivity stopped the idolatry, but simply that it continued *till* the captivity; from which we have no more right to conclude, that this was the cause of its cessation, than we should have for supposing, that the house of God being at Shiloh was the cause of its previous continuance (*v.*31). Nor, again, is it asserted, that the captivity affected directly the city of Dan, as the words are not 'the captivity of *their* land,' but 'of *the* land' generally. While that there was a universal abandonment of idolatrous practices throughout all Israel towards the close of this period of captivity, we are distinctly told (1Sam.vii.2-4). Then it was, no doubt, when Israel removed their 'strange gods', their 'Baalim' and 'Ashtaroth', and 'served Jehovah only,'—then it was that Micah's graven image was removed from Dan, and the sons of Jonathan ceased to minister.

There is, then, not the slightest reason for regarding *v.*30 as a later interpolation, or the name Jonathan as any less genuine than the others. But if so, then it is clear that names compounded with Jehovah were known long before the days of Samuel, and that divine title cannot have been invented by him as Bishop Colenso supposes.

In the book of Ruth only one proper name occurs compounded

with either of the divine names, 'El-imelech.' Here, therefore, as in Joshua, we have no adequate materials for a judgment, none certainly which could warrant us in concluding, that Jehovistic names were unknown at the time.

In the opening part of the first book of Samuel several names of prior date to his ministry also occur, among which are three compounded with Elohim,—El-kanah (i.1), El-eazar (vii.1), Samu-el (i.20), and perhaps Abi-el (ix.1).* There is also one containing *both* divine names — El-ihu (the same as Elijah = God is Jehovah), which, remarkably enough, is the name of Elkanah's grandfather, or in other words of Samuel's *great-grandfather* (i.1). Stronger proof of the existence of the name Jehovah before the days of Samuel cannot well be conceived.†

Taking now all the proper names of men which are recorded in these books as certainly given after the mission of Moses, but before that of Samuel, there appear to be but 12 out of 62 in which either of the divine names is employed; and of these, six are compounded with Elohim (including the doubtful case, Abiel), five with Jehovah (including the three doubtful ones, Joash, Jotham and Micah), one with both. Or, excluding the names whose origin is disputed, there are in all but 8 proper names certainly formed in this way, and of these 6 contain Elohim, and 3 Jehovah. These facts shew clearly that the custom of the times was, on the whole, opposed to the use of such names (whence the small number that have come down to us), but that of those which were so formed those compounded with Jehovah seem to have been about as common as those with Elohim. At any rate it is plain, that the name Jehovah must have been known long before the days of Samuel, and so the argument which would ascribe the Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch to a period later than his ministry on this account, falls to the ground at once.

---

* Abi-el may be either 'a strong father' or 'God my father.'

† This name is one of those adduced by Bishop Colenso as instances of early *Elohistic* names!

Besides the above evidence, however, there is also some important information to be obtained from the genealogies at the beginning of the first book of Chronicles, which furnish us with many names intermediate between Jacob's grandsons and Moses; a period of which the Pentateuch is all but silent. And among these names are several clearly compounded with Jehovah. Thus, among the descendants of Judah, we have Azar-iah in the third generation (ii.8), Ahi-jah in the fourth (ii.25), Jo-nathan in the sixth (ii.32), besides Ab-iah the wife of Hezron in the second (ii.24), Sera-iah also the brother of Othniel (iv.13), and perhaps Rea-iah in the sixth generation (iv.2), but this last is doubtful from the obscurity of the passage where it occurs. Among the descendants of Issachar appear Repha-iah apparently in the third (vii.2), Izrah-iah in the fourth (vii.3), Obad-iah, Jo-el and Ish-iah in the fifth (vii.3). Among the descendants of Benjamin are Jo-ash and Ab-iah apparently in the third (vii.8). There is also another grandson of Moses, Rehab-iah (xxiii.17), and a cousin Jes-iah (xxiii.20). Not that these form a large proportion of the names recorded. In the family of Judah there are some 70-80 names ranging from the first to the sixth generation, yet only six are compounded with Jehovah. Still they are certainly represented as more common than the data afforded by the Pentateuch would have led us to suppose; from which Bishop Colenso concludes, that they were all *invented* by the Chronicler, and merely serve to shew the general want of veracity that characterizes his statements. Now there can be no doubt but that the author of the books of Chronicles, writing some time after the restoration from Babylon, and therefore very far removed from the times of which he wrote, is in many points a less reliable authority than the authors of Samuel or Kings, who were probably for the most part contemporaries. But that he ever invented whole genealogies, as Bishop Colenso supposes, is most improbable, and has not the shadow of a proof in its support.

These genealogies of the Chronicler, directly we pass the range

of Jacob's grandchildren, are eminently obscure and confused; names are introduced as heads of families, of whom no previous mention has been made; fragments of minute information, often quite unintelligible, are inserted every here and there; while to crown all, the writer not unfrequently jumps from the grandsons of the patriarchs to matters connected with David and Solomon, so that it is plain he never intended his genealogies to be regarded as consecutive or complete. In fact very many of the Jehovistic names just enumerated are open to doubt upon this score. The descendants of Issachar, some of whom were noticed above, are given apparently to five generations, yet after the enumeration of two of these we have the startling statement, that these were 'valiant men of might in their generations, whose number in the days of David was 22,600'; and then after the remaining three generations have been given, we read, that all these were 'chief men', with whom 'by their generations, after the house of their fathers, were bands of soldiers for war, 36,000, for they had many sons and wives' (vii.2-4). It is certainly doubtful after this whether the names in question really belong to the age of Moses or the age of David. This of course would tend to diminish very considerably the apparent incongruity between the Pentateuch and Chronicles. Taking all things into account, indeed, there are but three Jehovistic names which we can assign with certainty to the time of the sojourn in Egypt, viz. Azariah, Ahijah, and Abiah (ii.8,24,25), all curiously enough in the family of Judah.

But there is another aspect in which this obscurity and confusion of the Chronicler's genealogies must be viewed. It is a fatal objection to the idea of his having *invented* the names contained in them, for surely had he done so he would have invented a few more, and so made his account clear and symmetrical. It may give us a clue, also, to the way in which these genealogies were framed. We have said that the Chronicler wrote some time after the restoration from Babylon. Now there can be little

doubt but that the larger proportion of the private annals preserved in the various families (whence such genealogies must have been drawn) perished during the captivity. Those which were preserved, however, would naturally be even more highly prized than before, and a writer who designed to commence his history of the Jewish kingdom with the genealogies of the chief men from the time of Adam to David, would be likely to grasp eagerly at every scrap of information at his disposal, transcribe every fragment he could lay hands on, no matter how disconnected from the rest, lest perchance it should be lost entirely. Of course, as the largest proportion of the people were of the tribe of Judah, most information might be expected concerning *their* ancestors. And so exactly we find it; the genealogies of Judah are by far the longest and fullest of any, though equally confused in parts. In further support of this theory may be mentioned the facts recorded by Nehemiah, (1) that great care was taken in making out the genealogies of those who returned from Babylon, and (2) that some, even of the priests, had *lost* their genealogies, and were excluded from the ministry on that account, until the matter could be referred directly to God (Neh.vii.5,61,64-5). If this view be right, it at once opens up another source of reconciliation between the Pentateuch and Chronicles; for how easily might the names in these family annals have been altered, in repeated transcription, to suit the fashion of the times, Elohistic names being replaced by their Jehovistic and now more familiar equivalents, El-nathan by Jo-nathan, Abi-el by Abi-jah, and so on. The possibility of such alterations in the names having been made, *before* they came into the hands of the Chronicler, will of course greatly diminish the value of their occurrence in the ages named, but this is a matter of little moment; the incongruity between the Pentateuch and Chronicles is removed, and our argument does not require their support. As a point of evidence, therefore, we are disposed to relinquish altogether the testimony of the Chronicler's genealo-

gies, valuable as it seemed at first sight; only protesting against the uncertainty of this part of his work being used as an argument against his veracity generally.

The other difficulties which the Jehovistic names in the Pentateuch are supposed to involve, will come under consideration further on.* We are content here to have vindicated the fact of *some* such names occurring, both in the age of Moses, and still more plentifully in those succeeding, as a proof that the name Jehovah was certainly known to him, if not also to his father and grandfather as well.

---

* No allusion has been made in the text to the name 'Moriah', which Hengstenberg has urged as an example of a Jehovistic name in the times of the patriarchs, and this for two reasons. 1. Because there seems no sufficient ground for identifying the 'mountain in the *land* of Moriah,' with the hill of that name on which the temple was built, and where according to Jewish tradition Abraham offered his son; and there is hence no *reason* for supposing the name to be compounded with Jehovah. 2. Because the name itself seems hardly capable of being formed in the way proposed, but is more probably either another name for 'Moreh' (Gen.xii.6, comp.Deut.xi.30, and Jud.vii.1), or an entirely distinct name 'Hamoriah,' the first letter ה being regarded as part of the word, rather than as the prefixed article. Some remarks on Bishop Colenso's two chapters concerning this name will be found in Appendix No.III.

CHAPTER IV.

THE USE OF JEHOVAH IN THE PSALMS.

(Bp. Colenso, Part II., Chap. XII.—XVIII., p. 267—329.)

THE argument which Bishop Colenso would build upon the Psalms is two-fold.

Firstly, the usage of the divine names in the earlier and later Psalms of David shews that Jehovah was an uncommon, and therefore a *new* name, at the commencement of his life, a common and well-known one at its close, agreeably to its supposed origin in the days of Samuel.

Secondly, there is one Psalm in particular (lxviii.), which it is clear, from internal evidence, must have been written before certain portions of the Pentateuch.

This latter is a distinct and independent argument, which will require careful consideration. The other is at once disposed of by the evidence adduced in the last chapter. Whatever may have been David's usage of the names Elohim and Jehovah, it is clear that it could not have arisen from any *ignorance* on his part of the latter name, since it was used in the formation of the names of Samuel's grandfather, and Moses' grandson. Nor is this all; the names of Samuel's two sons, Jo-el and Ab-iah (1Sam.viii.2), were both compounded with Jehovah, as were also the names of Saul's son Jo-nathan (xiv.1), of David's own sister Zeru-iah (1Chron.ii.16), and the high-priest Ah-iah (1Sam.xiv.3), all of whom must have been David's seniors by several years. These instances are advanced by Bishop Colenso as examples of the use of such names after the ministry of Samuel, overlooking apparently the important bearing which they have upon his argument

from the Psalms. For if so many names had been already compounded with Jehovah before the birth of David, names too with which he must have been familiar for years, how can it be reasonably argued, that his omission of Jehovah, supposing it to have been as constant and perfect as Bishop Colenso asserts, is to be ascribed to its being a *new* name, not sufficiently familiar to his mind for him to employ it in his Psalms? The former argument is destructive of the latter. If these Jehovistic names are an evidence that the name of Jehovah was introduced in the days of Samuel, then David must have been familiarly acquainted with that name from earliest childhood. And if he was so acquainted with it, then his omission of it in his earlier Psalms cannot have arisen from the cause assigned; and the phenomenon, however curious in itself, is, as an argument for the late origin of Jehovah, worthless.

But yet again; the argument is not only thus inconsistent with the known facts of the case, it rests upon a premiss altogether false. It is assumed, that the preference which any writer shews for one divine name above the other can only be accounted for by supposing that the name he omits was either unknown, or at all events very little used, in the times at which he wrote. Indeed so strongly is this position urged, that we are called upon to reject as absolutely false the most positive statements of the Pentateuch on its account.* Now, on what authority is this assumption founded? The only cases of an exclusive, or all but exclusive, use of Elohim, presented to us in the Old Testament, besides the

* In his chapter of Concluding Remarks, Pt.II.,p.378-9, Bishop Colenso writes as follows: 'We might have wished, indeed, that it were possible to suppose that the account of the revelation of the Name Jehovah, in Ex.iii.,vi., was also based upon legendary matter of fact,—that there were any clear signs of the existence of the word among the Hebrew tribes in an earlier age than that of Samuel. But the truth compels us to admit that there are no such indications. On the contrary, the evidence produced in this volume tends all in the opposite direction, to fix the introduction of the Name as having occurred in the age, and, therefore, we must suppose by the act, of Samuel.'

Elohistic sections in Genesis, and some of the Psalms, the two portions now under consideration, are—1. The discourses in the book of Job, containing Elohim 96 times, Jehovah once (*vide* Bishop Colenso, Pt.II.,p.261, note); and 2. The book of Ecclesiastes, containing Elohim 39 times, and Jehovah not once. Of the date of the book of Job we know nothing. Tradition has assigned it to Moses; it may therefore have been contemporaneous with the Elohistic sections of Genesis. But how about Ecclesiastes, the most remarkably Elohistic book in the whole of the Bible; was *it* certainly written before the Jehovistic sections of the Pentateuch?—is it 'inconceivable' that *its* author should have been familiar with Jehovah? Modern critics (with whom Bishop Colenso seems to agree, see Pt.III.,p.624) are disposed to ascribe its profound philosophy to an unknown writer after the captivity, rather than to the wise king of Israel. Then away with all Bishop Colenso's theories, about Samuel writing one part of the Pentateuch, and Nathan another, and Jeremiah a third. The earliest portions, the fundamental Elohistic matter of Genesis, cannot have been written until after the captivity; the Jehovistic assuredly much later. Ay, and not only the Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch, but *all* the historical books; the Psalms, on whose dates Bishop Colenso has bestowed such pains; the Proverbs of Solomon; the prophecies of Isaiah, first and second; of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and all their companions; all are later. For is not the name Jehovah found in all these?—and was it not also clearly *unknown* to the author of Ecclesiastes?—whom the all but unanimous consent of modern biblical critics has assigned to the age of the restoration from Babylon? For is it conceivable that he should have written such a work as this, in which the name Elohim occurs 39 times, but Jehovah not at all, if the latter name was used at the time?* It is hard to see in what

* Bishop Colenso, when speaking of David's omission of Jehovah in his earlier Psalms, says (Pt.II.,p.271)—'It seems absolutely impossible that either he, *or any other good man of those days*, should have done this, if the Name

respect this argument differs (logically) from that adopted by Bishop Colenso in respect to the Elohistic Psalms, except indeed in these three particulars—1. That it is less open to cavil, as the use of Elohim in Ecclesiastes is *exclusive*, which it is not even in the earliest Psalms. 2. That it is more consistent, since it would assign *all* Elohistic compositions to the same age. And, 3. that it is more destructive, seeing that it would serve to establish, with great show of reason, not only the Pentateuch, but almost the whole of the Old Testament, as unhistorical and forged.

Here then we might safely leave this portion of Bishop Colenso's argument, as sufficiently answered by its own inconsistencies, and faulty premisses. As, however, it is a part on which he has laid very great stress, and expressly challenged criticism, it may be as well to examine it a little more in detail. Putting aside, therefore, for the present, all reference to the proper subject of our controversy, the Pentateuch, let us endeavour to ascertain, from an examination of those Psalms whose dates can be fixed with some degree of certainty, what was in truth the usage of their authors in respect to these two names. The grounds we have to rest upon in determining these dates are—1. The titles of the Psalms; and 2. Their own internal evidence. The genuineness of these titles has, indeed, been much disputed, though with what reason it is hard to see, since they are found in all the manuscripts and versions extant, with no greater variations of reading than frequently occur in the text itself; while the accordance of most

---

was so common in the mouths of all pious and devout men, even of *heathen* persons [*e.g.* Sennacherib, the Babylonish captains, Cyrus, &c.] in his own and all the post-Mosaic ages, as the history represents.' And again, when speaking of the Elohistic Psalms generally, he says (p.329),—'The writer, or writers, it is plain, could not have been in the habit, at that time, of using familiarly the name Jehovah. It could not, therefore, have been commonly employed in the devotions of pious men in those days. And, if so, it could not have been freely in use *before* those days; and, above all, it could not have been known and recognized as the name which Almighty God Himself had revealed to Moses, and specially sanctioned as the name, by which He would be hereafter known in Israel.'

of them with the contents of their respective Psalms is an admitted fact.* We shall therefore adhere to them strictly, except very convincing evidence can be brought against them, entirely *independent* of the point under discussion, the use of the two divine names; since to employ *this* as a criterion of age would plainly be begging the question. Many of the Psalms naturally present very meagre signs of date, some none at all; we shall therefore merely present the evidence of those, whose date can be determined with some degree of probability; carefully noting all the grounds of our decision, and the objections taken to it, if in any case we differ from the conclusions arrived at by Bishop Colenso; merely pointing out the most striking signs of date, if we agree with him. It is only necessary further to premise, that for the sake of convenience we have arranged the Psalms in chronological order, dividing them into three groups—1. Those composed before David's accession to the throne (1Sam.xix.-xxvii.); 2. Those composed during the earlier portion of his reign, the period of foreign wars (2Sam.v.-xii.); 3. Those composed during the later portion of his reign, the period of civil wars (2Sam.xv.-xxiv.).

FIRST GROUP.

Psalm lix. was written, according to the title, by David 'when Saul sent, and they watched the house to put him to death' (1Sam.xix.); with which agree the expressions, 'Deliver me from mine enemies,' 'from them that rise up against me' (*v.*1), 'save me from bloody men' (*v.*2). 'They lie in wait,' 'mighty ones are gathered against me,' but 'not for my transgression' (*v.*3). 'They run and make preparations' (*v.*4), &c. Bishop Colenso appears to regard the title as reliable, though he would assign the composition of the Psalm to a later date, on account of *v.*11. 'Slay them not, lest *my people* forget,' which (he says) 'would seem to imply that the writer was *king* at the time.' Such an expression might, however, be used as naturally by any Israelite, as by a king (*e.g.*Jer.iv.20,ix.21-3), and certainly most naturally by one who was the anointed heir to the crown.

Psalm lvi. was written, according to the title, by David 'when the Philis-

* Thirteen only of the Psalms have titles bearing on the *occasion* of their composition, and eleven of these Bishop Colenso admits to be rightly assigned. The two disputed ones are *early* Jehovistic Psalms.

tines seized him in Gath' (1Sam.xxi.11-2); with which agree such passages as—'My adversaries pant the whole day, for many fight against me from on high' * (*v.*2). 'All day long they traduce me, all their thoughts are against me for evil. They gather themselves together, they hide themselves, they mark my steps, when they wait for my soul' (*v.*5-6). 'Regard thou my exile' (*v.*8), &c. (De Wette). And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm xxxiv. was written, according to the title, by David 'when he changed his behaviour before Abimelech, who drove him away, and he went away' (1Sam.xxi.13-15). An occasion quite in accordance with such expressions of thanksgiving as—'I sought Jehovah and he answered me, and delivered me from all my dread' (*v.*4). 'This poor man cried, and Jehovah heard, and saved him out of all his troubles. An angel of Jehovah encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them. O taste and see that Jehovah is good, happy the man that trusteth in him' (*v.*6-8). 'The eyes of Jehovah are upon the righteous, and his ears unto their crying' (*v.*15). 'Jehovah heareth and delivereth them out of all their troubles (*v.*17). 'Many are the afflictions of the righteous, but Jehovah delivereth him out of them all. He keepeth all his bones, not one of them is broken' (*v.*19-20). 'Jehovah releaseth the soul of his servants' (*v.*22) &c. Notwithstanding, Bishop Colenso is bold enough to assert, that there is 'no reason to believe that this Psalm was written with any reference to David's escape from Abimelech or Achish'; for that 'there is nothing whatever in its contents to bear out such a supposition' (p.307). How any contents could possibly be more agreed with the title it is certainly hard to see. However, let us see what particular objections he has to make. First of all he quotes Hengstenberg, who argues that the Psalm was written in some "subsequent part of his (David's) history," when "his mind became filled with lively emotions, arising from the recollections of his wonderful escape, in reference to which he says 'I will praise Jehovah *at all times*. His praise shall be *continually* in my lips.'" Words which would certainly refer as naturally to the many providential escapes he had already experienced,—from the lion and the bear, from Goliath, from Saul when he cast his javelin at him, and again when he sent to take him, and now lastly from the Philistines. The reasons which Hengstenberg advances for his view are three, 1. the 'quiet tone which pervades' this Psalm, shewing that it could not have been written when David was 'immediately threatened by danger'; 2. the 'predominant effort to draw consolation and instruction for the Church from his own personal experience'; and 3. the '*alphabetical arrangement*' which never occurs in Psalms of feeling merely, but only in those especially intended to edify others. To which Bishop Colenso further adds, that the expression in *v.*11, 'Come ye *children*, hearken unto me, I will teach you the fear of Jehovah,' would 'hardly have suited David at the age of 27 or for many years after.' To this we may reply, 1. That the Psalm is not represented as having been 'written at a moment of extreme peril,' but after a great and wonderful *deliverance;* 2. That it may very likely have been

* So Benisch: 'in haughtiness' De Wette; 'O thou Most-High' E.V.

composed some little time after the event referred to, whereby its calmness and artificial arrangement would be fully accounted for; and 3. That his becoming captain over a number of distressed and lawless men immediately afterwards (1Sam.xxii.2), with whom he continued for many years, would give ample occasion for the composition of a Psalm of this kind, for the express purpose of making his experience profitable for their 'consolation and instruction.' To them his subjects, also, the expression 'come ye children' &c. would be far from out of place; or it may have been used literally to the junior members of his father's and brethren's households, who resorted to him about the same time (xxii.1). Lastly, it is objected that the tone of this Psalm is 'very different' from that of the last mentioned one (lvi.), 'composed by David on this very occasion.' No doubt it is so; but then the occasion is *not* the same, for that was written when he was taken prisoner, this when he had made his escape; two occasions which might certainly reasonably give rise to Psalms of 'a very different tone' from one another. On the whole, then, there seems no good reason for doubting the accuracy of the title here, any more than in the two preceding or the next succeeding Psalms.

Psalm lii. was written, according to the title, by David 'when Doeg the Edomite came and told Saul, and said unto him, David is come to the house of Ahimelech' (1Sam.xxii.). Its accuracy is confirmed by such passages as —'Why boastest thou thyself in evil, O man of fury?'* (*v.*1). 'Thy tongue deviseth mischiefs like a sharp razor, O worker of deceit' (*v.*2). 'Thou lovest evil more than good; lying rather than to speak righteousness. Thou lovest all devouring words, O tongue of deceit' (*v.*3,4). And so also Bishop Colenso.

Psalm lv. is not assigned by its title to any particular occasion, being merely called an 'Instruction of David.' From the character of its contents, however, it may probably have been written shortly after the one last considered, when the full news of Doeg's treachery and cruelty had reached the wandering Psalmist (1Sam.xxii.21-23). The following are some of the passages which especially tend to support this conjecture. 'O that I had wings like the dove, that I might fly away and be at rest. Lo, I would escape far off, remain in the desert; I would make haste to escape from a rushing wind and tempest'† (*v.*6-8). His description of the city, 'I have seen violence and strife in the city' (*v.*9), 'iniquity also and trouble in the midst of it' (*v.*10), 'oppression and guile depart not from its streets' (*v.*11). As also of his principal enemy. 'A person of my station, my guide and mine acquaintance' (*v.*13) 'not an enemy,' 'neither he that hates me' (*v.*12), who 'put forth his hand against such as were at peacewith him' (*v.*20), whose words 'were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart', 'softer than oil, yet drawn swords' (*v.*21), &c. Some parts would indeed agree well with David's flight from Absalom, but on the whole the reference to the

* So De Wette; 'mighty man' E.V.; 'hero' Benisch.

† So Benisch and E.V.; 'I would escape swifter than a raging wind, than a tempest' De Wette.

slaughter of the priests at Nob seems most in accordance with its contents, and to this Bishop Colenso also assigns it.

Psalm liv. was written, according to the title, by David 'when the Ziphim came and said to Saul, Doth not David hide himself with us?' (1Sam.xxiii. 19-24); which is confirmed by the general tone of the Psalm, and especially by the expression, 'Strangers are risen up against me, and furious foes seek after my soul' (*v.*3). And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm lvii. was written, according to the title, by David 'when he fled from Saul in the cave' (1Sam.xxiii.24-9); with which agree well such passages as, 'In the shadow of thy wings will I take refuge, until mischief be overpast' (*v.*1), 'my soul is among lions,' 'sons of men whose teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword' (*v.*4). 'They have prepared a net for my steps,' 'they have digged a pit before me' (*v.*6), &c. So also Bishop Colenso.

Psalm cxlii. was also written, according to the title, by David, 'a prayer when he was in the cave,' though not necessarily of course the same cave as the last mentioned, or written at the same time, since David abode in 'caves' and 'holds' a long time on account of Saul (1Sam.xxiv., &c.). The tone of the Psalm suits well the occasion specified, as the following passage will shew. 'In the way wherein I walk have they *laid a snare* for me. Look on the right hand, and behold. There is no man that will know me; refuge hath failed me; no man enquireth after my soul. I cry unto thee, Jehovah; I consider, Thou art my refuge, my portion in the land of the living. Attend unto my calling, for I am brought very low; deliver me from my persecutors, for they are stronger than I; bring my soul out of prison, that I may praise thy name' (*v.*4-7). Yet does Bishop Colenso boldly assert, that 'there is nothing whatever in the contents of this Psalm, which helps to fix it to this occasion' (p.308). The only objection, however, which he has to make to its genuineness, is simply that it is unlikely that 'David should have written two Psalms *on the very same occasion*, in one of which he never uses the word Jehovah, while in the other he never uses Elohim.' This of course is merely 'begging the question.' The two Psalms moreover were not, as we have remarked above, necessarily written 'on the very same occasion,' there may have many months or even years between them. The only reasons which Hengstenberg, whom he quotes on the same side, adduces against the composition of the Psalm at the time named, are, 1. Its being called 'an Instruction,' 2. Its close connection with the cycle of Psalms of which it forms a part. To which we may reply, 1. That the name of 'Instruction' is also given to Ps.lii.,liv.,lv., all of which are supposed by Bishop Colenso to have been written in this part of David's life, on occasions of greater peril and emotion than this one. 2. That one at least of the adjoining Psalms (cxliii.) was probably written about the same time, while the similar feelings experienced by David at different periods of his life may have naturally led to an unchronological classification of many of them; even as Ps.li., concerning his murder of Uriah, is placed at the head of his very earliest Psalms, as part of the same 'cycle.' None of these reasons seem sufficient, then, to warrant us in rejecting the title as 'fictitious.'

Psalm lxi. is merely ascribed by its title to David, without any mention of the special occasion when it was written; it may, however, be probably assigned to the same period as the two last, from its resemblance in tone and sentiment; *e.g.* 'Thou art a shelter for me, a tower of strength from the enemy. Let me abide in thy tent for ever, shelter myself in the covert of thy wings' (*v.*3-4). It was clearly written by David himself, since he says, 'Thou hast given [me] the *heritage* of those that fear thy name' (*v.*5); while the prayer at the end, 'Add days unto the king's days; let his years be as many generations. Let him abide before God for ever. Let mercy and truth preserve him' (De Wette) (*v.*6-7), doubtless refers to Saul, and is quite in accordance with the respect and reverence ever accorded to him by David (see 1Sam.xxiv.6-15,xxvi.9-24,2Sam.i.14-6,iv.9-12). And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm lxii. is similarly unassigned by its title, but seems from internal evidence to belong to the same period, some passages in it being inappropriate to any other part of David's life, and especially *v.*3. 'How long will ye imagine mischief against a man? will you break him down, all of you, like a sinking wall, a fence that is thrown down?'* (comp.1Sam.xxiv.14,xxvi.20). So also Bishop Colenso.

Psalm cxliii. is equally without a special title, but may also probably have been written about the same time, though the internal evidence is not quite so conclusive. The following are some of the most characteristic passages contained in it. 'The enemy hath pursued my soul, he hath crushed my life to the earth, he hath thrust me into darkness, as those who have been long dead' (*v.*3). 'Deliver me, Jehovah, from mine enemies; with thee am I under covert' (*v.*9). Bishop Colenso, however, prefers to regard it as written at the time of David's flight from Absalom, to which it is assigned by several ancient versions (Sept. Vulg. Œth. Arab.), and with which its contents would accord very well, some expressions, indeed, being rather more appropriate on this view than on the other, *e.g.* 'Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for no one living is righteous before thee' (*v.*2), 'I remember the days of old' (*v.*5). None of these, however, are very strong objections, while on the other side we may note the expression, 'with thee I am under covert' (*v.*9), which is a favourite and oft-repeated idea in the Psalms of this period (xvii.8,lvii.1,lxi.4,lxii.7,8,lxiii.7,cxlii.5), but which does not once occur in any of the Psalms written during the flight from Absalom; and whose appropriateness to David's present situation, as contrasted with that experienced then, is too obvious to need comment. It may be doubted, moreover, whether the passage first quoted above (*v.*3) is so in keeping with Bishop Colenso's view, as also the petitions, 'Cause me to know the way wherein I should walk' (*v.*8), 'Teach me to do thy will' (*v.*10), which eminently suit a period of doubt and difficulty like that in which David was now placed. On the whole, therefore, we are disposed to prefer the earlier

* So De Wette and Benisch; 'ye shall be slain all of you; as a bowing wall [shall ye be, and as] a tottering fence,' E.V.

date first proposed, though the uncertainty which belongs to it must prevent any great stress being laid upon its evidence.

Psalm lxiii. was written, according to the title, by David 'when he was in the desert of Judah' (1Sam.xxvii.), with which perfectly agree such expressions as, 'My spirit thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee as a parched languishing land where is no water * (*v.*1); 'In the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice' (*v.*7); as also the allusion to Saul (comp.lxi.6-7 commented on above), 'The king shall rejoice in God; every one that sweareth by him shall glory when the lions' mouth is stopped' (De Wette) (*v.*11). And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm xvii. is entitled 'a prayer of David', and may be assigned with great probability to the same period of his life as the last-mentioned. The following are some of the expressions which naturally lead to this conclusion:—'Screen me under the shadow of thy wings, from the wicked that despoil me, mine enemies who with fury compass me about' (*v.*8-9). 'They have now compassed us in our steps; they have set their eyes inclining to the earth (*i.e.* to watch for our track†), like as a lion is greedy of his prey, and as it were a young lion lurking in secret places' (*v.*11-2). Bishop Colenso makes no mention of this Psalm.

Psalm lxxxi. is ascribed by its title to Asaph, one of the principal choirmasters in the reign of David (1Chron.xxv.1-6). The character of its contents, especially when contrasted with lxxix., another Psalm by the same author, would lead us to ascribe it to the period before the accession of David. And this for two reasons, 1. 'Joseph' is mentioned as the leading tribe (*v.*5), not 'Judah.' 2. We read in *v.*13-4 'Oh that my people would hearken unto me, that Israel would walk in my ways. Soon would I *subdue their enemies*, and turn my hand against their oppressors.' Words which could scarcely have been written during the warlike and victorious reign of Saul's successor. It is by Bishop Colenso attributed to Samuel, for which, however, the only reason alleged, is the reference to the Exodus in *v.*5-10, which it is argued would be most natural in the mouth of the (supposed) Elohist writer of the Pentateuch.

These are all the Psalms which we have any reason to assign to the early part of David's life. What then is their testimony as to the usage of the two divine names at this time?

1. There are eight Psalms whose titles (confirmed in every case by their contents) fix them to have been written during this period; they therefore may be regarded as furnishing the most certain and unimpeachable testimony. Of these, Ps.lix. contains Jehovah twice, Jehovah Elohim once, Elohim alone 8 times (four necessary). Ps.lvi. contains Jehovah once, Elohim 9 times. Ps.xxxiv. contains Jehovah 16 times, Elohim not once. Ps.lii. contains Elohim 5 times, Jehovah not once. Ps.liv. contains Jehovah once, Elohim 4 times. Ps.lvii. contains Elohim 7 times (once necessary), Jehovah not

---

* So De Wette; '*in* a parched land' E.V. and Benisch.

† So Benisch and E.V.; 'to bring [us] down to the earth' De Wette.

once. Ps.cxlii. contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim not once. Ps.lxiii. contains Elohim 3 times (once necessary), Jehovah not once. Or in all eight together; Jehovah 23 times, Jehovah Elohim once, Elohim 36 times, six of which, however, are necessitated by the Hebrew idiom. Deducting these, then, it would leave the conclusion thus; Jehovah 24 times, Elohim 30 times.

2. There are five other Psalms, ascribed to David, which we have seen reason to assign to this period; three with tolerable certainty, two more doubtfully. Of the three first named, Ps.lxi. contains Elohim 3 times, Jehovah not once. Ps.lxii. contains Elohim 7 times, Jehovah not once. Ps.xvii. contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim once. Of the other two, Ps.lv. contains Jehovah twice, Elohim 6 times. Ps.cxliii. contains Jehovah 4 times, Elohim once (necessary). Or in all five; Jehovah 9 times, Elohim 18 times (once necessary).

3. There is one other Psalm, not ascribed to David, which seems to belong to this period, Ps.lxxxi., which contains Jehovah twice, Elohim 5 times (4 necessary).

Taking now all the Psalms which may be assigned to our first group, we find in them Jehovah 35 times, Elohim 59 times; or omitting the necessary occurrences of the latter, Jehovah 35 times, Elohim 48 times. How far these facts agree with Bishop Colenso's bold assertion, that the early Psalms of David shew that 'though he *knew* the name Jehovah, yet he was certainly *not* in the habit of using it *freely*'; that 'he either used it not at all in his compositions, or used it very sparingly, *as if he was only now beginning to use it*, as if it was somewhat *new and strange to him* as yet, not so frequent on his lips, not so familiar to his thoughts, as the old and well-known name, Elohim'; — how these agree, we leave the reader to judge, reserving our own explanation of the phenomenon just detailed until our investigations are completed. We now pass on to the Psalms of the

SECOND GROUP.

Psalm lxviii. is entitled 'a Psalm and Song of David', and may be ascribed with certainty to the occasion of David's bringing up the ark from Gibeah (2Sam.vi.1-5). The opening phrase, 'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered; let them also that hate him flee before him' (*v.*1), is identical (in substance) with the shout raised by the Israelites at each removal of the ark in the wilderness (Nu.x.35); other allusions to their early history there are also found (see *v.*7-8,17). There is, further, the conclusive passage, 'They have seen thy marches, O God; the marches of my God, my king, in the *sanctuary*. Singers went before, players on stringed instruments after, in the midst of damsels playing with timbrels. Bless ye God in the full congregation; the Lord, ye of the fountain of Israel. There is Benjamin the youngest, their ruler; the chieftains of Judah, their company; the officers of Zebulon, the officers of Naphthali' (*v.*24-7). Many of these expressions would be inappropriate to any other occasion or time in the history of David. And with this Bishop Colenso fully agrees, to whom the reader is referred for a fuller statement of the case. The special arguments founded upon this Psalm will be considered in a later part of the chapter.

Psalm xxiv. is merely entitled like the last 'a Psalm of David.' It refers unquestionably to the same event, or rather, more probably, to the second bringing up of the ark, when it actually entered the gates of Jerusalem (2Sam.vi.12-7).* The following passages may be instanced in proof of this. 'Who shall go up the mountain of Jehovah? or who shall stand in his holy dwelling-place?' (*v.*3); and more especially this conclusive one, 'Lift up your heads, O ye *gates;* and be ye lift up, ye everlasting *doors;* that the King of Glory may come in. Who is this King of Glory? Jehovah the strong and mighty, Jehovah mighty in war. Lift up your heads, O ye *gates;* and lift them up ye everlasting *doors;* that the King of Glory may come in. Who is this King of Glory? Jehovah of hosts, he is the King of Glory.' (*v.*7-10). Bishop Colenso makes no mention of this Psalm.

Psalm xx. is entitled 'a Psalm of David,' but seems to have been written rather *for* David, than by him. It may be assigned with great probability to that period of David's reign when he was engaged in successful wars with the Philistines and Moabites, shortly after the capture of Jerusalem (2Sam.v. 17-25,viii.1-3,&c.). It was composed apparently as a parting benediction when the king set out with his army. 'Jehovah answer thee in the day of trouble; the name of the God of Jacob defend thee; send thee help from the sanctuary, and sustain thee out of Zion' (*v.*1-3). 'We will shout for thy victory, and in the name of our God will we wave our banners' (*v.*5). 'Now know I that Jehovah saveth *his anointed;* he will answer him from the heavens of his holiness with the might of the salvation of his right hand. These boast in *chariots*, and those in *horses;* but we in the name of Jehovah our God. They sink down and fall; but we rise, and stand upright' (*v.*6-8). Bishop Colenso assigns this Psalm to the civil war with Absalom, on account of the phrase 'the day of trouble,' as if there were no previous time of David's life which could merit this title. The mention of 'chariots and horses' seem to fix the enemies spoken of as certainly *foreigners;* and the whole tone of the Psalm is far too martial and jubilant to suit that most sorrowful and critical of David's wars.

Psalm cx. has a similar title, but was also unquestionably written by another hand 'on behalf of' or 'concerning' David. It seems to have been composed in celebration of his victories and firm establishment on the throne of his kingdom, shortly after the one last considered. The following passages may especially be noticed, 'The declaration of Jehovah unto my Lord; Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. Jehovah shall send the staff of thy might out of Zion; rule thou in the midst of thine enemies' (*v.*1-2). 'Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent. Thou art a priest for ever after the manner of Melchizedec.† The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath'

---

* It is entitled by De Wette 'A song of praise at the entry of the ark' (Lobgesang beim Einzuge der Lade).

† So De Wette; 'after the *order* of Melchizedec,' E.V.; 'my king of righteousness by my word' Benisch.

(*v.*4-5). Bishop Colenso would, however, assign it to the close of David's life, as written by him concerning Solomon. An improbable supposition, as the whole tone of the Psalm is warlike, and Solomon was essentially a king of peace. The allusion, moreover, to Melchizedec, to whose throne and office David had now succeeded, would be far more appropriate as applied to *him*, the first Jewish king of Salem, than to his successor. And besides all this there is the incongruity of David addressing his *son* as his 'Lord.'*

Psalm xxiii. is 'a Psalm of David,' which seems more in keeping with this period of his life, when everything looked smiling around him, than with any other. 'Jehovah is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside still waters' (*v.*1-2). 'Thou preparest a table before me, in the sight of my adversaries; thou anointest my head with oil, my cup runneth over. Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will abide in the house of Jehovah for a length of days' (*v.*5-6). These two last expressions seem to fix it with certainty to the beginning of David's reign, before the storms of domestic strife and civil war had marred its prosperous opening. Bishop Colenso makes no mention of this Psalm.

Psalm lx. was written, according to the title, by David 'when he strove with the Syrians of Mesopotamia and with the Syrians of Zobah, when Joab returned and smote of Edom in the valley of salt twelve thousand' (2Sam. viii.,x.). It was composed, clearly, after a partial defeat (unnoticed in the history), but in expectation of a victory. 'O God, thou hast cast us off, thou hast scattered us, thou hast been angry; restore us' (*v.*1). 'Who will bring me into the fortified city? who will lead me into Edom? Not thou, O God, who hast cast us off? and wilt not thou go out, O God, with our hosts?' (*v.*9-10). 'Through God we shall do valiantly; for he shall tread down our enemies' (*v.*12). And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm xliv. is entitled 'an instruction of the sons of Korah', and if written in the reign of David (of which we cannot be sure) it must have been composed on the same, or some similar occasion as the last, as the following passages will shew, 'Thou hast cast us off and put us to shame, and goest not forth with our hosts. Thou makest us to turn back from the adversary' (*v.*9-10). 'Thou makest us a reproach to our neighbours, a scorn and derision to them that are round about us' (*v.*13). 'Awake, why sleepest thou O Lord? arise, cast us not off for ever' (*v.*23). 'All this is come upon us; yet have we *not forgotten* thee, neither have we *dealt falsely in thy covenant*.

---

* In explaining these and other Messianic Psalms, in regard to their reference to David, it is by no means intended to set aside or dispute their further reference to the Messiah; this must, however, always be regarded as secondary, the other as primary. There seems no reason for supposing the Psalms to have been ever intended as *prophecies*, though the double reference in some of them may very probably have been known and recognized by their authors. To allude to this secondary meaning in the argument now before us would clearly be out of place.

Our heart is not turned back, neither have our steps declined from thy path' (*v.*17-8). These last expressions seem to shew that the Psalm was written before idolatry had become prevalent in the kingdom, and therefore most probably in the reign of David. And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm lxxx. is entitled 'a Psalm of Asaph,' and evidently refers to some similar occasion. From the mention of 'Joseph' as the principal tribe (*v.*1), also 'Ephraim, Benjamin and Manasseh' (*v.*2), it might be thought to belong rather to the first group. Against this, however, may be noted the manifest allusions to previous greatness and dominion (*v.*9-11), and in particular the petition in *v.*17, 'Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand, upon the son of man whom thou madest strong for thyself,' which would be far more appropriate as referring to David, than to Saul. And with this agrees Bishop Colenso.

Psalm lxxxiii. is another 'Psalm and Song of Asaph,' which might also be naturally assigned to the same period, only there is nothing to fix it certainly to David's reign, as the confederate nations mentioned in *v.*6-9 (Edom, Ishmael, Moab, Hagar, Gebal, Ammon, Amalek, Philistia, Tyre and Assyria) may refer, either to those enumerated in 2Sam.viii.12,x.6,16, or to those mentioned as confederating against Jehoshaphat in 2Chron.xx., when we know that one of the sons of *Asaph*, Jahziel, exhorted the king and people to rely upon Jehovah. Which of these two occasions is really referred to, it is impossible to say. Bishop Colenso apparently prefers the reference to the days of David.

Psalm ii. has no title whatever, and is therefore liable to the same uncertainty as the last, referring as it plainly does to some similar occasion, when a confederacy of various nations was formed against Jerusalem. The expression, 'Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us' (*v.*3), seems, however, to refer to tributaries who had revolted from the Jewish yoke, which would render the age of David the most probable. The parallelism between *v.*8, 'Demand of me, and I shall give thee nations for thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession,' and cx.1-2,5, already commented on, is another strong point in favour of its reference to David. Bishop Colenso, however, says that no such 'uneasy movement of this kind, among the nations whom David had actually subdued,' is anywhere recorded, and he therefore assigns the Psalm to the 'last years of David's life,' in as much as (he says) Edom and Syria did rebel and regain 'their independence immediately after Solomon's accession, 1K.xi.14-25.' To which we may reply, 1. That if Ps.lxxxiii. refers to these wars of David, as Bishop Colenso allows that it well may, then it is clear that not only were Moab, Edom, Philistia and Damascus 'uneasy' at the yoke imposed upon them, but actually joined with Ammon and the rest of Syria to war against Israel; while that the history in 2Samuel does not present us with every, even important, detail of the war, is clear from the omission of the defeat alluded to in Ps.lx. 2. That there is not the slightest reason to suppose any 'indications of turbulence' being visible among these nations 'in the last years of David's life,' since they 'brought presents, and served Solomon all the days of his life' (1Kings iv.21), and 'he had peace on all

sides round about him' (*v.*24). It was not till 'the *old age* of Solomon,' when 'his wives inclined his heart after other Gods' (xi.4), that 'Jehovah was wroth with him' (*v.*9), and allowed Hadad and Rezon, who before were only 'hinderers,' to reign in Damascus (*v.*14-5). The reference to the middle part of David's reign seems, therefore, the most natural and appropriate.

Psalm xxxv. is said by its title to belong to David, and has every appearance of having been written on the return of his messengers from the King of Ammon (2Sam.x.1-6). It was clearly composed at a time when war was imminent. 'Strive, Jehovah, with them that strive with me; fight against them that fight against me. Take hold of shield and buckler, and for my help arise. Wield the spear and axe* against them that pursue me' (*v.*1-3). His enemies, also, are those towards whom he had shewn friendship, especially in their *sickness*, but who now bore false witness against him, and hated him without a cause. 'False witnesses rise up; they ask me what I know not. They requited me *evil for good*' (*v.*11-2). 'But as for me, when they were *sick*, my clothing was sackcloth; I afflicted my soul with fasting' (*v.*13). 'As though he had been a fellow, a brother unto me, I walked about; I bowed down heavily, as one mourning for his mother' (*v.*14). 'Let not them that are mine enemies wrongfully rejoice over me; neither let them wink with the eye that *hate me for nothing*' (*v.*19). There seems no other event in David's life to which these expressions can be naturally referred. Bishop Colenso makes no mention of this Psalm.

Psalm. xxv. has a similar title, and refers probably to the same period. 'Let not mine enemies exult over me' (*v.*2). 'Let them be ashamed who are *treacherous without cause*' (*v.*3). 'See mine enemies, for they are many, and they hate me with an unjust hatred' (*v.*19). 'Release Israel, O God, out of all his troubles' (*v.*22). The evidence is not so conclusive as in the last one, but the tone of the Psalm seems to agree better with this occasion, than with any other. It may perhaps have been written after David's sin in the matter of Bathsheba and Uriah, which occured *during* this very war with Ammon. This view is favoured by such expressions as the following. 'Remember not the sins of my youth, nor my transgressions; according to thy mercy remember thou me for thy goodness' sake, Jehovah' (*v.*7). 'For thy name's sake, Jehovah, pardon mine iniquity, for it is great' (*v.*11). 'See mine affliction and my pain, and forgive all my sins' (*v.*18). Bishop Colenso makes no mention of this Psalm.

Psalm xxvii., said also to belong to David, is very similar in tone to the last, only more jubilant, as if written after the first victory of Joab over the combined Ammonites and Moabites, though before the war had been brought to a successful termination (2Sam.x.7-14). Instance the following passages. 'When the wicked, my adversaries and enemies, came upon me, to eat up my flesh, they stumbled and fell. Though a camp should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear; though war should rise against me, even in this

---

* So De Wette; 'Draw out also the spear and stop [the way] against, &c'. E.V.; 'and grasp it against,' Benisch.

will I be trustful' (*v.*2-3). 'Now shall my head rise high above mine enemies round about me' (*v.*6). 'Give me not over according to the desire of mine adversaries, for *false witnesses* rise up against me, and breathe out violence' (*v.*12). Bishop Colenso makes no mention of this Psalm.

Psalm ix. is entitled 'a Psalm of David,' and was clearly composed towards the conclusion of a great and successful war, wherein David's honour had been at stake. 'Thou hast maintained my right and my cause, thou satest on the throne as Judge of Righteousness. Thou hast rebuked nations, thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast blotted out their name for ever and ever' (*v.*5-6). 'Nations are sunk down in the pit that they made; in a net which they hid is their own foot caught' (*v.*16). 'Sing praises unto Jehovah who dwelleth in Zion, declare among the peoples his doings' (*v.*12). This Psalm also is unnoticed by Bishop Colenso.

Psalm cxxiv. is one of the songs chanted by the worshippers as they ascended the Temple mount, 'a Song of Degrees of David,' which evidently refers to some great deliverance like that alluded to in the last. 'If it had not been Jehovah who was for us, now may Israel say;—if it had not been Jehovah who was for us, when men rose up against us; then they had swallowed us up alive, when their wrath glowed against us' (*v.*1-3). 'Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowlers; the snare is broken, and we are escaped' (*v.*7). The only objection to this conjecture is, that the title (which is the only reason for assigning this Psalm to the reign of David) is wanting in 3 Mss. and the ancient versions. Bishop Colenso says that it 'may have been written in David's old age'; why, he does not tell us; nor yet what great deliverance from foreign enemies there was in his 'old age,' which should call forth a Psalm of this special character.

Psalm li. was written, according to the title, by David, 'when Nathan the prophet come unto him, after he had come to Bathsheba,' (2Sam.xi.-xii.25). The complete accordance of its contents with this occasion is too well known to need illustration, which would require indeed (to be complete) the citation of nearly the whole Psalm. And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm cxxxviii. is said by its title to belong to David, and may be probably assigned to the close of the war with Ammon, thanksgiving for deliverance being its principal feature. 'I will prostrate myself before the temple of thy holiness, and praise thy name for thy mercy and thy truth'. 'In the day when I cried thou answeredst me' (*v.*2-3). 'Though I walk in the midst of trouble, thou wilt revive me; thou shalt stretch forth thy hand against the wrath of mine enemies, and thy right hand shall save me' (*v.*7). It is somewhat doubtful owing to the omission of the title by some few Mss. and versions. According to Bishop Colenso it 'may have been written by David in his old age,' again without any reason being given.

Psalm xxi. is called 'a Psalm of David,' and was almost certainly written on the occasion of the capture of Rabbah (2Sam.xii.26-31), which brought this long war to a conclusion. The allusion to the royal crown which was set 'on David's head,' in *v.*3 is unmistakeable. 'Thou didst meet him with the blessings of goodness; thou settest a *crown of pure gold* on his head.' While the mention of the origin and end of the war is also very confirmatory.

'Thy hand shall find out all thine enemies; thy right hand shall find out those that hate thee. Thou shalt make them as a *fiery oven* in the time of thine anger' (comp. 2 Sam.xii.31, he 'made them to pass through the brickkiln,'); 'Jehovah shall swallow them up in his wrath, and fire shall devour them. Their fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth, and their seed from among the children of men. For they intended evil against thee; they imagined a *mischievous device*, which they were not able to perform' (*v.*8-11). The only remarks which Bishop Colenso makes upon this Psalm are, that it was written when 'David was advanced in years', on account of the expression, 'He asked life of thee, thou gavest him length of days for ever and ever' (*v.*4); and that it was composed by some one *for* David during Absalom's rebellion. That it was not written by David himself may readily be granted; but that such a jubilant Psalm should have been written in a time of such extremity is most improbable; while the space of time between the capture of Rabbah and the rebellion of Absalom was probably not so great, that it would much affect the propriety of the rejoicing at the length of David's reign, and the prospect of its continuance.

Psalm cxliv. is ascribed by its title to David, and accords well with this part of his reign. 'Blessed be Jehovah my rock, who traineth my hands to war, and my fingers to fight' (*v.*1), 'who subdueth my people under me' (*v.*2). 'Send thy hands from above; free me and deliver me from the great waters, from the hand of *alien children*, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of *falsehood*' (*v.*7-8). 'It is he that giveth salvation unto the kings; who delivereth David his servant from a hurtful sword' (*v.*10). Bishop Colenso remarks that it '*may* be one of his later Psalms,' once more without the slightest reason being alleged.

These are all the Psalms which we have reason to believe were written during the second of the three periods into which we have divided David's life. Let us briefly sum up the evidence which they afford us concerning his usage of the divine names.

1. There are two Psalms whose titles (supported most amply by their contents) fix them to belong to this group. Ps.lx. which contains Elohim five times, Jehovah not once; and Ps.li. which contains Elohim six times (once necessary), Jehovah not once.

2. There are seven Psalms, ascribed to David, but without special titles, which may be assigned with *certainty* to this period. Of these, Ps.lxviii. contains Elohim 31 times (5 necessary), Jehovah 4 times. Ps.xxiv. contains Jehovah 6 times, Elohim once (necessary). Ps.xx. contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim 3 times (all necessary). Ps.cx. contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim not once. Ps.xxxv. contains Jehovah 8 times, Elohim twice (both necessary). Ps.ix. contains Jehovah 9 times, Elohim once. Ps.xxi. contains Jehovah 4 times, Elohim not once. Or in all, Jehovah 39 times, Elohim 38 times (11 necessary).

3. There are six Psalms, also ascribed to David, which were *probably* written in this period. Of these, Ps.xxiii. contains Jehovah twice, Elohim not once. Ps.xxvii. contains Jehovah 13 times, Elohim once (necessary). Ps.xxv. contains Jehovah 10 times, Elohim 3 times (twice necessary). Ps.

cxxiv. contains Jehovah 4 times, Elohim not once. Ps.cxliv. contains Jehovah 4 times, Elohim twice (once necessary). Ps.cxxxviii. contains Jehovah 6 times, Elohim not once. Or in all, Jehovah 39 times, Elohim 6 times (4 necessary).

4. There are 4 Psalms, not ascribed to David, which we have seen reason to include in this group, as probably written in the same period. Ps.xliv. contains Elohim 5 times (once necessary), Jehovah not once. Ps.lxxx. contains Jehovah Elohim twice, Elohim alone 4 times. Ps.lxxxiii. contains Jehovah twice, Elohim 4 times (once necessary). Ps.ii. contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim not once. Or in all, Jehovah 7 times, Elohim 13 times (twice necessary).

Taking now all these together, we find in the Psalms belonging to this part of David's life, Jehovah 83 times, Elohim 68 times, 18 of which however are necessary. We now pass on to consider the

THIRD GROUP.

Psalm xxii. is entitled a Psalm of David, and may be referred almost certainly to the time of his flight from Jerusalem on account of Absalom's rebellion (2Sam.xv.). The depth of his distress,—'My God, my God wherefore hast thou forsaken me' (*v.*1) 'O my God, I call by day, but thou answerest not; and by night, and there is no silence for me' (*v.*2). The scorn with which he was regarded,—'I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and scorned by the people. All they that see me *laugh me to scorn;* they distort the lip, they nod the head, saying, Let him trust on Jehovah, let him rescue him, let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him' (*v.*6-9). His utter helplessness,—'I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax, it is melted in the midst of my breast. My strength is dried up like the potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou layest me in the dust of death' (*v.*14-5). The spoliation of his property,—'They divide *my garments* among them and cast lots upon my *vesture*' (*v.*18). All these characteristic features seem to point to the flight from Absalom as the event in David's history to which this Psalm must be referred. Bishop Colenso passes it by unnoticed.

Psalm lxix. is said by its title to belong to David, and is very similar in tone to the last. A few illustrative passages must suffice. 'Save me, O God, for the waters are come in unto my soul. I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me. I am weary of my crying, my throat is parched, mine eyes fail while I wait for my God' (*v.*1-3). 'I am become estranged from *my brethren*, and an alien unto my mother's children' (*v.*8). 'They that *sit in the gate* talk against me; and I am the song of the drunkards' (*v.*12). 'Disgrace hath broken my heart, and I am [sick]; and I looked for some to take pity, but there were none; and for comforters, but I found none' (*v.*20). This also must clearly be referred to the flight from Absalom; and so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm vii. was written, according to the title, by David 'concerning

the words of Cush, a Benjamite,' which is generally supposed to be a metaphorical name (Cush = Ethiopia) for Shimei, who cursed David as he passed away from Jerusalem (2Sam.xvi.5-13). Shimei was one of the house of Saul, and doubtless accused David of disloyalty towards his former master, to which David apparently refers when he says, *v.*3-5, 'O Jehovah my God, if I have done this, if there be unrighteousness in my hands; if I have rewarded evil unto him that was at peace with me, and robbed him who without cause was my adversary;* let the enemy pursue my soul and take it, yea let him tread down my life upon the earth, and lay mine honour in the dust.' The mildness of his reply to the curses heaped upon him,—'His evil shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate' (*v.*16), is also quite in keeping with David's rebuke to Abishai, 'Let him alone, and let him curse, for Jehovah hath bidden him. Perhaps Jehovah will see my misery, and Jehovah will requite me good for his cursing this day' (2Sam.xvi.11-2). And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm cix. is entitled 'a Psalm of David', and seems to have been composed on the same occasion as the last, from which however it differs, in that it denounces vengeance upon the curser in terms of accumulated violence. 'Set thou a wicked man over him, let an adversary stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him go forth condemned, and let his prayer become sin. Let his days be few; let another take his office. Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow. Let his children continually wander about and beg, and let them seek [their bread] also out of desolate places.† Let a usurer catch all that he hath, and let strangers spoil his labour. Let there be none to extend mercy unto him; neither let there be any to favour his fatherless children. Let his posterity be cut off; in the generations following let their name be blotted out. Let the iniquity of his fathers be remembered with Jehovah, and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out; let them be before Jehovah continually, that he may cut off the memory of them from the earth. Because that he remembered not to shew mercy, but *persecuted* the *poor and needy man*, and the *broken-hearted* to the very death. As he *loved cursing*, so let it come unto him; as he delighted not in blessing, so let it be far from him. As he *clothed himself with cursing*, like as with his garment, so let it come into his bowels like water, and like oil into his bones; let it be unto him as the garment which covereth him, and for a girdle, wherewith he is girded continually. Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from Jehovah, and of them that speak evil against my soul' (*v.*6-20). This may readily be explained. Shimei's cursing continued after David's rebuke to Abishai, and was remembered long afterwards (see 1Kings,ii.8-9,44), with the full expectation that his cursing would eventually be 'returned upon his own head.' It was an act which affected David, not

* So De Wette; 'Set free my adversary empty-handed,' Benisch; '(Yea, I have delivered him that without cause is my enemy)' E.V.

† So Benisch and E.V.; 'far from their ruins' De Wette.

only personally, but also as the anointed of Jehovah, the divine representative upon earth. One, therefore, which might justly call for imprecations upon the offender, when the first deep feeling of personal humiliation had somewhat passed away. That David's maledictions were not vindictive is plain, from his refusing to punish Shimei, when the power was in his hands. Bishop Colenso also assigns this Psalm to the same occasion.

Psalm xli. is entitled 'a Psalm of David', and may be referred to that point in his flight when Barzillai and Shobi and Machir brought him refreshment and assistance, when also the counsel of Ahitophel was reported to him (2Sam.xvii.27-9). The allusions to these two incidents are very plain, in addition to other general references to the circumstances of the time. 'O happiness of him that considereth the *afflicted;* Jehovah will deliver him in the day of evil' (*v.*1.) 'Mine enemies speak evil of me, When shall he die and his name perish?' (*v.*5). 'Yea, mine *own familiar friend,* in whom I trusted, who did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me' (*v.*9). And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalms xlii.-iii. (evidently one composition) belong, according to the title, to 'the sons of Korah'. Their connection with David is hence quite conjectural; but if his, then they must have been written about this time. They were clearly composed by some one compelled to absent himself from the worship of God, 'My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God; when shall I come and appear before God?' (xlii.2). 'I went with the multitude, I marched in pilgrimage with them to the house of God, with the voice of rejoicing and praise in a festive crowd' (xlii.4).—By some one in deep distress, because of the oppression and reproach of enemies, 'My soul is cast down within me' (xlii.6). 'All thy waves and thy billows have passed over me' (xlii.7). 'Wherefore go I mourning because of the oppression of the enemy? With a sword in my bones* mine enemies reproach me, while they say daily unto me, Where is thy God?' (xlii.9-10). 'Judge me, O God, and strive in my strife against an *impious nation;* O deliver me from a deceitful and unjust man' (xliii.1).—By some one exiled in the neighbourhood of Jordan, 'I will remember thee from the land of Jordan and the Hermonites, from the hill Mizar' (xlii.6).—By some one who looked confidently forward to restoration, 'Wherefore art thou cast down, O my soul? and wherefore wailest thou over me? Hope thou in God, for I shall yet thank him, the salvation of my person,† and my God' (xlii.5,11,xliii.5). These indications are certainly very strongly in favour of its having been written by David at this period of his life. Bishop Colenso, however, would prefer to assign it to the time of his wanderings near the Jordan before the death of Saul, regarding xliii.1 'a deceitful and unjust man' as referring to Doeg the Edomite. To this conjecture we may reply as follows:—1. The taunt which David here mentions, 'where is thy God,'

---

* So Benisch and E.V.; 'with a crushing of my bones' De Wette.

† So Benisch; 'my Saviour' De Wette; 'the health of my countenance' E.V.

is nowhere alluded to in the Psalms composed during that period of his life, but is exactly parallel to that referred to in those which were written during the war with Absalom (xxii.8,iii.2). 2. The expression 'mountain of holiness' (xliii.3), as referring to the place of public worship, seems to point most probably to Mount Zion, though it might perhaps be explained as referring to the sanctuary of Nob on the Mount of Olives. 3. The 'deceitful and unjust man' might reasonably be Absalom, since it is to be noted that David does not desire his *destruction* (as in the case of Doeg, lii.5), but merely to be *delivered* from him (comp.xxii.20-1,lxix.18-28,xli.10,iii.7,&c.). On the whole, it seems best to assign these Psalms, as we have done, to the period of Absalom's rebellion.

Psalm iii. was written, according to the title, by David 'when he fled from Absalom his son,' with which its tone and contents well agree. 'Jehovah how numerous are my adversaries; many are they that rise against me. Many say of my soul, 'There is no salvation for him in God' (*v.*1-2). 'I will not be afraid of myriads of people, that have set themselves against me round about. Arise, Jehovah; save me, O my God' (*v.*6-7). And so Bishop Colenso.

Psalm xl. is entitled 'a Psalm of David,' and seems to have been written about this time, with special reference to that sin of David's (in respect to Bathsheba), of which Absalom's rebellion was the fitting punishment. This appears to be alluded to in the following passage, 'I waited patiently for Jehovah, and he inclined unto me, and heard my cry. He brought me up also out of the pit of destruction, out of the miry clay, and set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings' (*v.*1-2). While the exact parallel between *v.*6, '*sacrifice and oblation* thou didst not desire; . . . *burnt offering and sin offering* hast thou not demanded,' and li.16, 'Thou desirest not *sacrifice*, else would I give it; thou delightest not in *burnt offering*,' is too remarkable to be overlooked. The circumstances in which he was now placed are also clearly set forth. 'Evils without number have compassed me about; mine iniquities have overtaken me, so that I am not able to look up; they are more than the hairs of my head, therefore my heart faileth me. Be pleased, Jehovah, to deliver me; Jehovah, make haste to help me. Let them be ashamed and confounded together, that seek after my soul to destroy it; let them be driven backward and be confounded, that wish me evil; let them be desolate because of their shame, that say unto me, Aha, aha' (*v.*12-5). The only remark which Bishop Colenso makes upon this Psalm is to point out the identity (substantially) of *v.*13-7 with Ps.lxx.; which he would explain by supposing the latter to have been first composed (during the flight from Absalom), and then afterwards appended to a still later one. The only reason assigned is the curious variation in the usage of the divine names, lxx. twice reading Elohim where xl. reads Jehovah, once Jehovah where xl. reads Elohim, once Elohim where xl. reads Adonai. This is certainly but poor ground to go upon. The close connection between the sections in Ps.xl. would rather favour the hypothesis, that these latter verses were part of the original composition, but subsequently detached for some other purpose.

Psalm xiii. is called 'a Psalm of David,' and may be assigned with some

probability to the critical period immediately after Absalom's defeat and death, when Israel first seemed inclined to secede from Judah (2Sam.xx.1-6); it might, however, refer to any other of David's times of extremity with nearly equal propriety. The following are some of the most remarkable passages: 'Until when wilt thou forget me, Jehovah, for ever?' (*v.*1). 'Until when shall I be anxious in my soul, having sorrow in my heart all day? until when shall mine enemy be exalted over me?' (*v.*2-3). 'I will sing unto Jehovah, because he hath dealt well with me' (*v.*6). Bishop Colenso makes no mention of this Psalm.

Psalm v. has a similar title, and appears to belong to the same period. Here also we find allusion made apparently to Joab's murder of Amasa, so hateful in the eyes of David. 'Thou shalt destroy them that speak falsehood; Jehovah will abhor a *bloody and deceitful man*' (*v.*6). Among the general characteristic passages we may instance the following: 'Attend unto the voice of my cry, my King, and my God, for unto thee I pray' (*v.*2). 'Lead me, Jehovah, in thy righteousness, because of mine adversaries; make thy way straight before my face. For there is no faithfulness in their mouth, their inward part is very wickedness, their throat an open sepulchre, they *smoothen their tongue*. Declare them guilty, O God; let them fall by* their own counsels, cast them out for the multitude of their transgressions, for they have rebelled against thee' (*v.*8-10). Bishop Colenso makes no comment on this Psalm.

Psalm xxviii. is said by its title to belong to David. It agrees well with this period of his life, being evidently written in a time of distress, and containing the same allusions to treacherous associates (not enemies) as the last. 'Unto thee will I call, Jehovah my rock; be not deaf unto me, lest if thou be silent to me, I resemble those that go down into the pit' (*v.*1). 'Draw me not away with the wicked, and with workers of iniquity, who *speak peace to their fellows*, but *evil is in their hearts*. Give them according to their deeds, and according to the evil of their endeavours; give them after the work of their hands, render to them their desert' (*v.*3-4). 'Jehovah is the stronghold of the salvation of his anointed' (*v.*8). Bishop Colenso leaves this also unnoticed.

Psalm xxvi. is called 'a Psalm of David,' and appears to be a prayer on the occasion of the treachery and evil dealing of some of his associates, in which he might be supposed to be implicated; very probably, therefore, composed at this time on account of the murder of Amasa, since the clear allusions to the services of the sanctuary preclude the idea of a reference to that of Abner. 'Judge me, Jehovah, for I have walked in my innocence' (*v.*1). 'I have not set with vain persons, neither will I go in with *dissemblers*' (*v.*4). 'I will wash my hands in innocence; so will I compass thine altar' (*v.*6). 'Gather not my soul with sinners, nor my life with *bloody men*' (*v.*9). 'My foot standeth in an even place; in the congregations will I bless Jehovah' (*v.*12). This Psalm is not alluded to by Bishop Colenso.

---

* So Benisch and E.V.; 'bring to nought' De Wette.

Psalm iv. is entitled 'a Psalm of David,' and seems to have been written when his sovereignty was again re-established, yet while some discontent was still visible. 'Thou hast enlarged me in the distress; be gracious unto me and hear my prayer. O ye sons of men, until when shall my glory be for scorn?—will ye love emptiness, and seek after falsehood?' (*v.*1-2). The plain allusion to a release from famine in *v.*7, 'Thou hast put gladness in my heart from the time *their corn and their must increased*,' seems to fix it as written after the three years of famine mentioned in 2Sam.xxi.1-14. This Psalm again is unmentioned by Bishop Colenso.

Psalm xxxviii. is called 'a Psalm of David,' and was evidently composed on account of some great and crying sin, which had brought down Jehovah's wrath in a signal manner; very probably therefore at the time of the numbering of the people, and the consequent pestilence (2Sam.xxiv.). Only a few of the most striking passages can be selected. 'Jehovah, punish me not in thy anger; neither chasten me in thy fury. For thine arrows stick fast in me, and thy hand presseth me sore' (*v.*1-2). 'Mine iniquities are gone over my head; as a heavy burden they are too heavy for me. My stripes are fœtid and fester, because of my foolishness' (*v.*4-5). 'I will declare mine iniquity, I will grieve by reason of my sin' (*v.*18). Bishop Colenso, indeed, refers it to David's sin respecting Bathsheba and Uriah; but against this may be urged, 1. The absence of any such similarity between this Psalm and li. as might reasonably have been expected on this supposition. 2. The improbability of *that* sin having called forth two penitential Psalms, and *this* none. 3. The allusions to bodily disease as a punishment (*v.*3,5, 7-8), which is highly probable if the pestilence be referred to, but unlikely if merely the death of his child. 4. The marked difference of tone between this Psalm and li.; that laying most stress upon the *spiritual wickedness* of the sin, this upon its *temporal consequences*.

Psalm xxxii. is styled 'an Instruction of David,' and was clearly written on a similar, most probably the same, occasion as the last, only rather later, since it speaks of the sin as forgiven. The following passages are especially worthy of note. 'O happiness of him whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered' (*v.*1). 'When I kept silence, my bones consumed through my roaring all the day long; for by day and night thy hand was heavy upon me' (*v.*3-4). 'I made known my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not covered. I said, I will confess my transgression unto Jehovah; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin' (*v.*5). Bishop Colenso makes no comment on this Psalm.

Psalm xxx. was written, according to the title, by David, as 'a Song for the dedication of the house.' It might, therefore, seem to belong to the same group as lxviii. and xxiv.; it more probably, however, refers to that dedication of the site of the future temple (for which David made such great preparations), alluded to in 1Chron.xxii. This seems clear from the *retrospective* character of the Psalm, its allusions to seasons of prosperity and adversity, and especially its reference to personal danger from which the writer had but lately been delivered (comp.Ps.xxxviii. commented on above). The following passages may be selected by way of illustration. 'Jehovah,

my God, I cried unto thee, and thou hast healed me. Jehovah, thou hast brought up my soul from the grave; thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit' * (*v.*2-3). 'For a moment he abideth in his wrath, for a life-time in his kindness;† weeping setteth in at evening, but in the morning is joy. But in my prosperity I said, I shall never totter. Jehovah, in thy pleasure thou hast strengthened my mountain. Thou didst screen thy face, I was troubled. I cried to thee Jehovah, yea Jehovah I besought. What profit is there in my blood, my going down to the pit? Shall dust praise thee? shall it tell thy truth? Hear, Jehovah, and be gracious unto me; Jehovah, be thou my helper. Thou hast turned for me my lamentation into dancing; thou hast put off my sackcloth, and girded me with gladness' (*v.*5-11). And with this agrees Bishop Colenso.

Psalm xviii. was composed by David (according to the title) 'in the day Jehovah delivered him from the hands of all his enemies, and from the hand of Saul.' It is found also (with a few verbal variations) in 2Sam.xxii., whence it may be ascribed with certainty to the close of David's life. And with this its contents well agree, as it consists of a long retrospect of troubles and deliverances, mercies and victories. To quote passages in illustration would be to quote the whole Psalm; for confirmation of this kind we must, therefore, refer the reader to the Psalm itself, especially as Bishop Colenso admits that it must have been written at the close of David's life, 'if written by him at all,' which he seems to doubt, though without assigning any reason; but which is certainly as clearly proved in this case as in any other, if not more so, since we have a double copy instead of a single, the second inserted by the historian in his narrative of David's life, and so additionally authenticated by his important testimony.

Psalm xxxvii. is ascribed by its title to David, and contains the results of his experience concerning the wicked and the righteous, their fortunes and their fates. That it was composed towards the end of his life is plain from the expression, 'I was young, and *now am old;* yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread' (*v.*25). Bishop Colenso makes no mention of this Psalm.

Psalm xlv. is called 'an Instruction of the sons of Korah, a Song of loves'. It would seem to have been written for the marriage of Solomon, either with Pharaoh's daughter, as is commonly supposed, or, as Bishop Colenso argues, with Naamah the Ammonitess. Written, therefore, either at the commencement of Solomon's reign, or the end of David's.

Psalm lxxii. is said by its title to belong to Solomon. It was probably composed, however, before the death of David, and about the time of Solomon's proclamation as king (1Kings,i.). This seems plain from the opening verse, 'Give the *king* thy judgments, O God, and thy righteousness unto the *king's son*'. And so Bishop Colenso.

---

* So Benisch and E.V.; 'Thou callest me back into life, from those that go down to the pit' De Wette.

† So De Wette and Benisch; 'in his favour is life' E.V.

These are all the Psalms which there seems reason to assign to the last of the three periods into which we have divided David's life. It only remains now to speak of their usage of the divine names.

1. There are three Psalms, ascribed to David, with special titles, which fix them as belonging to this period. Of these, Ps.vii. contains Jehovah 7 times, Elohim 6 times (3 necessary). Ps.iii. contains Jehovah 6 times, Elohim twice (once necessary). Ps.xxx. contains Jehovah 10 times, Elohim twice (both necessary). Or in all, Jehovah 23 times, Elohim 10 times (6 necessary).

2. There are ten Psalms, ascribed to David, whose contents serve to determine their connection with this part of his life with great probability. Of these, Ps.xxii. contains Jehovah 6 times, Elohim 4 times (all necessary). Ps.lxix. contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim 9 times (twice necessary). Ps.cix. contains Jehovah 7 times, Elohim twice (once necessary). Ps.xli. contains Jehovah 6 times, Elohim once (necessary). Ps.xl. contains Jehovah 9 times, Elohim 4 times (all necessary). Ps.xxvi. contains Jehovah 6 times, Elohim not once. Ps.xxxii. contains Jehovah 4 times, Elohim not once. Ps.xxxviii. contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim twice (both necessary). Ps.xviii. contains Jehovah 17 times, Elohim 11 times (7 necessary). Ps.xxxvii. contains Jehovah 15 times, Elohim once. Or in all, Jehovah 78 times, Elohim 33 times (21 necessary).

3. There are four Psalms, also ascribed to David, which may be assigned to this group with some probability, though less certainly than the last. Of these, Ps.xiii. contains Jehovah 3 times, Elohim once (necessary). Ps.v. contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim 3 times (twice necessary). Ps.xxviii. contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim not once. Ps.iv. contains Jehovah 5 times, Elohim once (necessary). Or in all, Jehovah 18 times, Elohim 5 times (4 necessary).

4. There are four Psalms, not ascribed to David, whose contents shew them to belong to the same period. Of these Ps.xlii.-iii. contain Jehovah once, Elohim 21 times (9 necessary). Ps.xlv. contains Elohim 4 times (once of a man, once necessary), Jehovah not once. Ps.lxxii. contains Jehovah Elohim once, Elohim alone twice (once necessary). Or in all, Jehovah twice, Elohim 26 times (11 times necessary).

Taking all these together, we find in the third group, Jehovah 121 times, Elohim 74 times, of which however 42 are necessary.

And now, what conclusions are we to draw from this examination?

1. It is plain that there was a change in David's use of the divine names as he grew older, Jehovah becoming far commoner than Elohim, while at first they were used nearly equally, or if anything Elohim most frequently. Taking only those Psalms which appear to have been written by David himself, and dividing them into two classes, (*a*) certain and very probable, (*b*) less

probable and doubtful, the following comparison may be made, omitting for simplicity's sake all occurrences of Elohim necessitated by the Hebrew idiom.

Group I. (*a*) J. 27, E. 41; (*b*) J. 6, E. 6; Total, J. 33, E. 47.

Group II. (*a*) J. 27, E. 37; (*b*) J. 39, E. 2; Total, J. 66, E. 39.

Group III. (*a*) J. 101, E. 17; (*b*) J. 19, E. 13; Total, J. 120, E. 30.

2. Notwithstanding, David wrote some Jehovistic Psalms at *all* periods of his life, though more commonly towards its close. Thus in group I. we have three, xxxiv. (J. 16, E. 0), cxlii. (J. 3, E. 0), xvii. (J. 3, E. 1); in group II. also three, xxiv. (J. 6, E. 0), xxxv. (J. 8, E. 0), ix. (J. 9, E. 1); in group III. all but two.

3. He wrote also Elohistic Psalms in his later days as well as in his earlier. Thus in group II. there are three, lxviii. (J. 4, E. 26), lx. (J. 0, E. 5), li. (J. 0, E. 5); in group III. two, xlii.-iii. (J. 1, E. 12), lxix. (J. 5, E. 7).

4. He sometimes wrote Jehovistic and Elohistic Psalms for the same occasion, or at all events very shortly after one another. Thus lvi. (J. 1, E. 9), and xxxiv. (J. 16, E. 0), were both written concerning events which transpired at Gath; lvii. (J. 0, E. 6), and cxlii. (J. 3, E. 0), when he was wandering about in caves and holds because of Saul; lxviii. (J. 4, E. 26), and xxiv. (J. 6, E. 0) for the bringing up of the ark; xxii. (J. 6, E. 0), lxix. (J. 5, E. 7), and xlii.-iii. (J. 1, E. 12), when he fled from Absalom.

5. His earliest known Psalm (lix.) contains the two names in nearly equal proportion, Jehovah 3 times, Elohim 4 times. His last recorded words (2Sam.xxiii.1-7) are, curiously enough, still more Elohistic, containing Elohim 4 times, Jehovah but once.

6. David's usage was not always followed by contemporaneous writers, so that it cannot be regarded as necessarily representing

the customs of the times. Thus Ps.xlv. was written (by another hand) just at the end of his reign (see above, p.75), and contains Elohim twice, Jehovah not once. Ps.lxxviii. might also be instanced, being clearly written some time after his accession,* and yet containing Elohim 15 times, Jehovah but twice.

The case clearly is not as Bishop Colenso states it. Jehovistic Psalms are found among David's earliest compositions; proved to be so by as clear and convincing internal evidence as can be adduced on behalf of any of the more Elohistic ones; albeit Bishop Colenso says 'he has looked for such a Psalm in vain.' Psalms of *both* kinds are found belonging to the *same* period of David's life; although, according to Bishop Colenso, Pt.II.,p.319,

'It is incredible, according to the ordinary laws of the human mind, that David should, *in the very same part of his life*, have written a number of Psalms with Elohim occurring on the average *six* times to Jehovah once, in several of which Jehovah does not occur at all, and another number of Psalms, in which Jehovah occurs on the average *four* times to Elohim once, and in many of which Elohim does not occur at all.'

And these mis-statements involve the whole of his position.

His argument, logically stated, stands thus.—In the early part of David's life he rarely or never used the name Jehovah in his compositions; this can only be explained by supposing that name to have been unfamiliar to his ears, and not in common use; therefore that name must have been very recently introduced, and could not have been known to Moses. A careful consideration of the whole question has shewn that *both* premisses are false. David *did* use Jehovah, at times exclusively, in his earliest Psalms. His preference for Elohim *is* explicable on other grounds, being

* The Psalm consists of a review of Israel's history from the time of the Exodus up to the reign of David, but no further; concluding with the words, 'He chose David also his servant, and took him from the sheepfolds; from behind milch-ewes he brought him, to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance. So he fed them according to the integrity of his heart, and guided them by the skilfulness of his hands' (v.70-2), which could scarcely have been written after his death, or in the still more glorious reign of his successor.

more than paralleled by the later Ecclesiastes. It is needless to say, that this being so, Bishop Colenso's *conclusion* is unproven.

Here then, again, we might fairly leave the question, and proceed to the consideration of the second part of the argument,—that concerning Ps.lxviii. and its precedence of certain portions of the Pentateuch. Perhaps, however, a few words in explanation of the phenomena we have just been considering may not be out of place, as shewing the utter needlessness of Bishop Colenso's theory to account for their occurrence.

It is probable, that when the name Jehovah was first introduced, it was for some time the favourite and distinctive name of Israel's God, as contrasted with the more generally known Elohim, which was used by other kindred nations as well. We might, therefore, reasonably expect that the writings of those who lived at the time, or shortly after the time, of its introduction, would be characterized by an all but exclusive use of the new title, at least if their authors were leading men of the age. Just such is the phenomena presented by the larger portion of the Pentateuch; Elohim being scarcely ever used except where the idiom of the language necessitated it (see p.12-3). It would be natural, also, that after the novelty had worn off, the sharp distinction between the two names would be forgotten, and they would come to be regarded as almost synonymous. All would then depend upon the preference of each particular author, just as in the case of any other words; and the choice actually made would be, in ninety-nine cases out of the hundred, absolutely inexplicable. One name might still be generally preferred perhaps, but this would depend upon habit rather than upon reason; while the slightest variations of occasion or feeling might produce the most complete change of usage, without any sufficient cause or motive being apparent. Who would be prepared to account for his own employment of the various divine titles in use amongst ourselves? Who would attempt to assign a reason why one Christian speaks of God's Son as Jesus, another as Christ, a third as Our Lord, a

fourth as Our Saviour, and so on? Who would venture to decide upon the genuineness, integrity, and date of the Epistles, by reference to their usage of the divine titles? (see p.15, note). Causes and reasons for all these things no doubt there are; but their connection with the phenomena is so slight and uncertain, so liable to variation from the least disturbing circumstance, that to deduce the one from the other is a hopeless task. Just so we might expect that it would be with the Jewish names for God. So soon as Jehovah and Elohim became fairly established on an equal footing, it was to be expected that their usage would become subject to variations, for the most part quite incapable of explanation. That this was actually the case in the time of David seems clearly established from the evidence already adduced. The use of Jehovah and Elohim in the Psalms has been shewn to be in great measure independent both of date and occasion, and unaccountable by any fine-drawn theory. Suppose, however, that it arose from the habits or involuntary preferences of the authors, both names being now well known, and regarded as all but synonymous, and all is clear and natural. In further support of this view the following facts may be noticed.

1. Elohistic Psalms are found of much later date than the reign of David; exceptional cases, certainly, but quite as clearly marked as those commented on by Bishop Colenso. It will be sufficient to instance two.

Psalm lxxvi. contains Jehovah once, Elohim 4 times (twice necessary). It seems to have been composed on the occasion of the destruction of Sennacherib's army before Jerusalem (2Kings,xix.). The opening verse, 'In Judah is God known; his name is great in Israel', seems to point unmistakeably to a time subsequent to the division of the kingdom, since Judah is never used in this way as equivalent to the whole people, and paralleled with Israel, in any Psalms written before the partition (comp.Ps.xiv.8,xxii.23,liii.6, also lxxx.1,lxxxi.4-5.). That it was written after some great deliverance is also evident, from the jubilant tone which pervades it, and especially from such passages as the following: 'Thou, thou art terrible; and who may stand before thee when once thy wrath is kindled? Thou didst cause judgment to be heard from heaven, the earth feared and was still' (*v.*7-8). 'He shall cut off the spirit of princes, he is terrible to the kings of the earth,' (*v.*12).

It was a deliverance which occurred in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem. 'In Salem also is his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Zion. *There* brake he in pieces the arrows of the bow, shield, and sword, and war' (*v.*2-3). In addition to all which there are the striking expressions in *v.*5-6. 'The stout-hearted are spoiled, they *sank in their sleep;* and none of the men of force have found their hands. At thy rebuke, O God of Jacob, both chariot and horse are *stupified.*' The Septuagint title expressly describes it as written 'concerning the Assyrian,' which Bishop Colenso would understand as referring to the Syrians with whom David was at war. With this however the characteristics noted above do not at all agree. The only ground on which Bishop Colenso rests his decision is the occurrence of the phrases 'Israel' and 'Jacob,' which he says point to the time of the 'undivided kingdom.' A comparison of the usage of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the other prophets, will shew that both these terms were constantly used in later times, in the same way as here, and hence cannot be regarded as signs of time.

Psalm lxxiv. contains Jehovah once, and Elohim 5 times. It was written undoubtedly at the time of the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar, as the following passages will shew: 'Remember thy congregation, which thou hast acquired of old; the rod of thine inheritance, which thou hast redeemed; this Mount Zion, wherein thou hast dwelt. Lift up thy steps unto the perpetual desolations, all that the enemy hath done wickedly in the *sanctuary.** Thine adversaries roar in the midst of thy *appointed place;* they set up their signs for signs' (*v.*2-4). 'They shatter the carvings thereof at once with hatchets and hammers. They have set thy *sanctuary* on fire, they have defiled the dwelling-place of thy name to the ground' (*v.*6-7). And so Bishop Colenso.

2. There are numerous instances of Elohim occurring in *Jehovistic* Psalms, where Jehovah would have been equally appropriate, (*e.g.*v.10, xiv.5, xvi.1, xvii.6, xviii.32,47, xxv.22, xxxvi.17, lxxxix.7) shewing the little distinction between them really made. While still more strikingly, there are several Elohistic Psalms which *contain Jehovah* occasionally in *ordinary* passages, but fail to use it where *we* should suppose it to have been most required, *e.g.* Ps.xliii.4. 'upon the harp will I thank thee, O God my God,'—instead of 'Jehovah my God' (comp.xlii.8). Ps.xlviii.14. 'For this God is our God for ever and ever,'—instead of 'Jehovah is our God,' (comp.*v.*1,8). Ps.l.7. 'I will testify against thee, God thy God even' (lit. 'God, thy God, I'),—instead of 'I, Jehovah thy God,' (comp.*v.*1). Ps.lxviii.8. 'the presence of God, the

* So Benisch and E.V.; 'the enemy destroyeth all things in the Sanctuary' De Wette.

God of Israel,'—instead of 'Jehovah God of Israel'; *v.*20. 'God is unto us a God of salvation,'—instead of 'Jehovah is unto us &c.' (comp.*v.*4,16,19,20). Ps.lxxvii.13. 'Who is a great God like God?'—instead of 'Who is a great God like Jehovah?' (comp.*v.*11). It is clear that at the time these passages were written, Jehovah was *not* regarded as in any respect a greater or more distinctive divine title than Elohim, but both were used indifferently.

3. There are three instances of Psalms or portions of Psalms *repeated*, whose diversity in regard to the divine names shews that their usage was regarded as a thing of little moment. Ps.xiv. is identical with liii., but the former contains Jehovah four times where the latter reads Elohim. Ps.xl.13-7 is identical with lxx., but the former contains Jehovah twice where the latter reads Elohim, once Adonai where the latter has Elohim, and once Elohim where the latter has Jehovah. Ps.lvii.7-11,lx.5-12 are identical with cviii., but the former has Adonai once, where the latter reads Jehovah.

4. The historical records of the same period contain Elohim far more commonly, than those of the earlier and especially of the Mosaic times. Thus in 1Sam.iii.-vi. there are no fewer than 19 cases of the occurrence of Elohim, besides these necessitated by the Hebrew idiom, or nearly as many as are to be found in the whole of the three last books of the Pentateuch (22).

All things considered, then, it seems clear, that the variations in the usage of the two divine names observable in the Psalms must have arisen from *both* being now so familiar and well-known, that the sharp distinction originally existing between them was forgotten, and they were regarded as synonymous titles, which might be employed just according to the predilection or involuntary preference of each individual writer. But if so, then not only does this at once do away with all Bishop Colenso's argument, it serves also to fix the introduction of the name Jehovah, as having taken place *a long time before the reign of David*, and

thus furnishes a valuable confirmation of the truthfulness of the Pentateuch.

We pass now to the second division of Bishop Colenso's argument,—the special considerations which lead him to assign Ps.lxviii. to an *earlier* date than certain portions of the Pentateuch. The occasion and character of this Psalm have been discussed above (p.62), and we then saw reason to regard it as composed for the first bringing up of the ark (2Sam.vi.1-5). It appeared also to be essentially Elohistic, containing Elohim 31 times (5 necessary), Jehovah, or its abbreviated form Jah, but 4 times. The principal argument, on which Bishop Colenso grounds his assertion of its priority to certain portions of the Pentateuch, is as follows:—The opening verse of the Psalm 'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered, let them also that hate him flee before him,' is identical with the watchword used at each removal of the ark in the wilderness (Nu.x.35), with the exception that there *Jehovah* is used, here *Elohim*. It is clear that one of the two passages must have been taken from the other. Most commentators regard that in the Pentateuch as the original, that in the Psalm as the copy;* Bishop Colenso maintains the reverse. Before proceeding to consider the special reasons advanced on behalf of his view, it will be well to draw out the two theories somewhat more fully, that we may see which yields the simplest explanation, and presents the fewest difficulties.

According to the ordinary view, the case stands thus.—This ancient watchword had been used to express the protection and blessing which the presence of the ark of the covenant was believed to bring upon the host, with especial regard to the

* The majority of Rationalist critics, while admitting the appropriateness of the Psalm to the occasion of the bringing up of the ark, prefer to assign it to a considerably later age, even after the captivity; and hence they have no difficulty in harmonizing the priority of Nu.x.35 with their theories of the date of the Pentateuch. Their arguments for the late date of the Psalm will be found fully stated and answered by Bishop Colenso p.296-305.

conquest of the land of Canaan, and the victory of God's chosen people over all their foes. The ark had led them through the wilderness (Nu.x.33), the presence of the ark was necessary to their success in arms (Nu.xiv.44), the ark had guided them through Jordan (Josh.iii.), had headed the strange procession round the walls of Jericho (Josh.vi.), had been sought for by the degenerate Israelites in Eli's days as a sure charm to ensure success (1Sam.iv.3-8), and on each and all of these occasions had doubtless been heralded forth with this familiar watchword. Now it was to be brought unto its final resting-place. New victories over external foes on the one hand, and over the remnant of the unsubdued Canaanites still dwelling in the land on the other, had ushered in a new and brighter state of things. David's successes against the Philistines, and capture of the old Jebusite stronghold, were hailed as happy omens of prosperity, and tokens of divine approval. And, as with dancing and rejoicing the visible symbol of the divine presence was borne along, attended by all the pomp and splendour which the court could boast, the old triumphant watchword came back once more in all its freshness and propriety, and formed a fitting keynote to the joyous Psalm composed by Israel's king for this august occasion. Expanded in form and slightly altered in phraseology (by the substitution of Elohim for Jehovah, now regarded as equivalent terms,) to suit the general character of the Psalm, it yet owed its chief propriety to the reminiscences which clung to it, the thoughts of ancient triumphs and divine deliverances which it brought back to mind.

According to Bishop Colenso's view, the case stands very differently.—The whole Psalm was the unaided composition of David, its opening phrase being adopted by a subsequent writer, as appropriate to the traditionary journeyings of the ark in by-gone times. David was at this time just becoming familiar with the name Jehovah; which he had however already used with freedom in the composition of many Psalms, and which had been employed in the formation of the names of several of his

relatives and companions, besides other noted personages now some years dead. He was acquainted with the story of its origin as imagined by the prophet Samuel, and regarded it therefore as a new and distinctive title of the covenant God of Israel,* whose introduction among the people was one of the favourite wishes of that venerated seer. He had a Psalm to write wherein the glories of that covenant God should be extolled before the attendant multitudes. Yet so little familiar was he with this name, that while acquainted with its abbreviated form 'Jah'† and ready to employ it to intensify the commoner names Elohim and Adonai, he could not bring himself to use it above four times in all. A few years later, and so well known had it become, that a writer in his own reign, and probably in attendance at his own court, unhesitatingly altered his royal master's words to suit the customs of the times, and applied them, thus corrected, to events which had occurred some centuries before.

It will be seen that the difficulties arising from this change of Jehovah for Elohim, are thus by no means confined to the ordinary view, but are even greater on that advocated by Bishop Colenso. That such a change should have been made with centuries intervening is surely more likely, than that it should have been made when only a few years had passed away, and by one too (as Bishop Colenso supposes) who may himself have

---

* According to Bishop Colenso, 'Jehovah' was regarded as the distinctive *covenant* name of God in the days of Samuel and David. Strikingly discordant with this idea is the fact, that in the history of the capture and recovery of the ark in 1Sam.iv.-vi., among the 33 times that it is mentioned, it is 19 times called the 'ark of Elohim', 14 only the 'ark of Jehovah'. An additional proof of the familiar and equivalent use of both names in those times already insisted upon (see p. 79-82).

† The stress which is laid in *v.*4 upon 'Jah' being the name of God is urged by Bishop Colenso as an indication 'that the name had been newly introduced.' But similar phrases are to be found in the writings of the Hebrew poets and prophets of all ages. See, for example, Ex.iii.15,xv.3, Dt.xxviii.58,Ps.lxxxiii.18,cxxxv.13,Is.xlii.8,xlvii.4,xlviii.2,li.15,liv.5,Jer.x. 16,xvi.21,xxxi.35,xxxii.18,xlvi.18,xlviii.15,li.19,57,Amos,iv.13,ix.6,&c.

'helped to chant' the words as originally written, 'when the procession with the ark wound its way up the hill of Zion.' There remain now three special reasons urged by Bishop Colenso for the priority of the Psalm, which will require consideration, in addition to those more general arguments concerning the change of the divine names just discussed.

1. It is said, that 'v.1 of the Psalm is closely connected with the words that follow, and has all the appearance of being an original utterance, poured forth by the same impulse which gave birth to them.'

Ans. The *closeness* of the connection simply amounts to this.—That which is stated in v.1 in simple prose, is repeated in v.2 in poetical metaphor, and completed in v.3 by a contrast with the good, and their relations to God. 'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered; let them also that hate him flee before him. As smoke is driven away, drive them away; as the melting of wax before fire, let the wicked perish at the presence of God. But let the righteous rejoice, let them exult before God; yea, let them be jubilant in rejoicing.' An expansion certainly quite as natural and probable, if v.1 were a quotation, as if it were original. It is to be noted also, that the antithesis in Nu.x.35-6 is maintained by the watchword used on encamping, '*Return*, Jehovah, upon the myriads of Israel', not as here by the direct contrast of the evil and the good. Had the author of the Pentateuchal narrative copied the first watchword from this Psalm would he not more probably have used the *whole* of the passage, which seemed so complete and 'closely connected'?

2. It is said that 'in the Psalm we have the *older* grammatical forms יָנוּסוּ, יָפוּצוּ, אוֹיְבָיו, where the other has יָנֻסוּ, יָפֻצוּ, אֹיְבֶיךָ.'

Ans. The difference, it will be observed, merely consists in the manner of writing the vowels וּ and וֻ, whether with or without the ו, and does not in any way affect the sense. It is asserted that the insertion of ו is the more ancient way of writing, and may therefore be regarded as a reliable sign of date. Passing over the *a priori* improbability, that the language should have undergone so notable a change within the few years which Bishop Colenso supposes to have intervened between the composition of the Psalm and the passage in Numbers, a point he seems entirely to have overlooked, we may reply to this as follows.

(i.) The manner of writing these vowels is one of the points upon which manuscripts frequently differ, so that we can never be quite sure *which* way the original document was written. It is remarkable that in this very passage (Ps.lxviii.2) several Hebrew Mss. read יָפֻצוּ as in Nu.x.35, and not the 'older form'.

(ii.) The first word mentioned אוֹיֵב 'enemy', is found twice besides in the same Psalm (v.22,24), and on both occasions according to the more *modern* form, and not 'the older'. Both in fact occur commonly in David's Psalms, but the *modern* form most frequently.

(iii.) This *old* form is found in seven places in the Pentateuch, Ex.xv.6,9, Lev.xxvi.25,Nu.xxxv.23,Dt.xxxii.27,42,xxxiii.27. All of which Bishop Colenso would regard as written *after* Ps.lxviii.; four, indeed, as coming from the hand of *Jeremiah*.

(iv.) It is found besides, in Judges 5 times, Job twice, 1Kings 3 times, 1Chronicles 4 times, 2Chronicles 5 times, Proverbs twice, Psalms of David's age 24 times, later Psalms 11 times (three of these are in Ps.lxxiv. which is admitted by Bishop Colenso to have been written during the captivity at Babylon), Isaiah twice, Jeremiah 3 times, Lamentations 8 times, Ezekiel once, Micah once, Hosea once, Nahum once, Ezra twice, Nehemiah 3 times, Esther once. All of which ought consequently to be regarded as of *earlier* date than Nu.x.35.

(v.) The second word mentioned פוּץ 'scatter', is found in this *old* form only here in the Psalms. It occurs also in Gen.xi.4; once in 2Chronicles, twice in Jeremiah, twice in Ezekiel, once in Zephaniah, and twice in Zechariah. In all 10 times, 8 of which date either in or after the reign of Josiah.

(vi.) The third mentioned word נוּס 'flee', is nowhere else found according to this 'older form' in the Psalms of David. It occurs, however, 11 times in the Pentateuch, Gen.xix.20,Ex.xiv.25,xxi.13,Nu.xxxv.15,26,32, Deut.xix.3,4,5,xxviii.7,25.

(vii.) Besides these instances it is found, in Joshua 4 times, Judges once, 2Samuel 4 times, 1Kings once, 2Kings once, 1Chronicles twice, 2Chronicles once, Proverbs once, later Psalms twice, Isaiah 4 times, Jeremiah 3 times, Amos 3 times.

(viii.) On the whole, these 'older forms' of the three words in question occur 19 times in the Pentateuch, 12 times in other historical books probably composed before the reign of David, 31 times in David's Psalms and the historical books of the same period, 74 times in writings certainly later. A pretty clear proof that they are no indications of time whatever.

3. This Psalm contains the ancient name of God, 'Shaddai' (the Almighty) *v.*14.

Ans. This name is to be found in many of the later books, *e.g.* Ruth,i.20, 21,Is.xiii.6,Ezek.i.24,x.5,Joel,i.15, besides Ps.xci.1 (a Jehovistic one), and Nu.xxiv.4,16. Its occurrence cannot therefore be regarded as any sign of date.

No satisfactory evidence of priority being thus discoverable on behalf of the Psalm, let us look at the matter from the other point of view, and see what grounds there are for assigning it to a *later* date than the Pentateuch. These may be briefly summed up as follows.

1. The Psalm contains the expression 'my God, my *King*'

(*v.*24), a title which is common in writings of the time of David and later,* but which is not once found in the Pentateuch.

2. The opening verse is not the only part of the Psalm which reminds us of the Pentateuch. *v.*33-4. 'To him that *rideth* (רֹכֵב) *upon the heavens* of heavens of *old* (קֶדֶם); lo, he doth send out his voice, a voice of might. Ascribe ye might unto God; *his excellency* (גַּאֲוָה) is over Israel, and his might in the *sky*' (שְׁחָקִים), are strikingly like Deut.xxxiii.26-7. 'There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who *rideth* (רֹכֵב) *upon the heavens* in thy help, and in *his excellency* (גַּאֲוָה) on the *sky*(שְׁחָקִים). The God of *ancient times* (קֶדֶם) is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.' Here, without any direct quotation, is an amount of similarity, which makes it highly probable that one was taken from the other. The blessing of Moses is certainly the simpler of the two, and therefore probably the more ancient.

3. There is also another clear case of quotation, this time from the book of Judges. In the song of Deborah and Barak, Jud.v. 4-5, we read as follows; 'Jehovah, *when thou wentest out* of Seir, *when thou marchedst* out of the field of Edom, *the earth shook, the heavens dropped*, the thick clouds also dropped water. Mountains flowed down *from before* Jehovah, *that Sinai from before* Jehovah *God of Israel*.' In Ps.lxviii.7-8 we have, 'God, *when thou wentest out* before thy people, *when thou marchedst* through the waste, *the earth shook, the heavens also dropped from before* God; *that Sinai from before* God, the *God of Israel*.' The points of divergence it will be seen are, (1.) the change of Jehovah for Elohim; (2.) the substitution of *general* expressions, 'thy people,' 'the waste,' for particular names, 'Seir,' 'the field of Edom;' (3.) the expansion of the idea of *rain* being given from God, in *v.*9 of the Psalm, 'Showers of abundance thou, O God, didst send about; thine inheritance, when weary, thou didst establish,' in place of the

* It is found 20 times in the Psalms, 4 times in Isaiah, 4 times in Jeremiah, 3 times in Zechariah, and once in Malachi.

abrupt transition in the song. Bishop Colenso naturally regards the first of these differences as decisive for the priority of the Psalm. But after all that has been said it were unnecessary further to combat this position. It stands upon the same footing as the quotation in *v.*1, and must be judged in the same way. The other points of difference are certainly in favour of the priority of the song. A yet farther quotation from the same source is to be found in *v.*18, 'thou capturedst captives,' a phrase suggested doubtless by the expression in Jud.v.12, 'capture thy captives, thou son of Abinoam.' This would serve to establish Ps.lxviii. as later, not only than the Pentateuch, but also than the book of Judges.*

Looking back now upon the whole of our investigations concerning the Psalms, we see in every part the strongest ground, not only for rejecting Bishop Colenso's theory as to the origin of the name Jehovah, and the Samuelistic authorship of the earlier portions of the Pentateuch, but also for believing implicitly in the pre-Davidic origin of the whole volume, and even of some of its historical successors. It matters not whether we inquire into the general characteristics of the Psalms, and their usage of the divine names, or whether we minutely examine the peculiarities of one selected instance, the conclusion to be deduced is still the same. The name Jehovah *must* have been introduced long before the days of David, the Pentateuch *must* have been in existence before his accession to the throne.

---

* The objection made by Bishop Colenso, that it is unlikely that David should have borrowed so many passages of his song from other documents, is one which refutes itself; since it is surely quite as unlikely that three writers (according to his theory), two of them poets of as high standing as David, should have drawn upon this *one* Psalm for materials, and neglected all the others, as that David should have culled from *them* choice passages of ancient poetry to enrich his own composition, and carry back his hearers to those early times to which such frequent allusion is made.

CHAPTER V.

SIGNS OF TIME IN THE FIRST FOUR BOOKS.

(BISHOP COLENSO, PART II., CHAP. V.—VI., P. 198—222.)

LEAVING now, for a time, the discussion of the origin and date of the name Jehovah, with which the two last chapters have been principally concerned, we proceed to consider the third division of Bishop Colenso's argument for post-Mosaic authorship,—that founded upon the occurrence in the Pentateuch of anachronisms and other similar signs of later origin (see p.40-1); merely omitting for convenience' sake those which concern the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua, which will find place further on.

These signs of later date, are divided by Bishop Colenso into two classes, according to their importance and conclusiveness, the latter part being, he admits, capable of some explanation consistent with the generally received notion of the date of the Pentateuch, the former, we must suppose, he would say, not. We shall consider them seriatim.

1. In Ex.xxx.13,xxxviii.24,25,26, the 'shekel of the Sanctuary' is mentioned as well-known, before the Sanctuary was in existence.

This has been already fully considered and refuted (Hist. Charact. Pent. p.51 note). The phrase is introduced as used by God when giving directions about the construction of the Sanctuary, and the tax which was to be levied for its establishment. The shekel is not referred to as well-known, but rather as something *new*, since its weight (20 gerahs) is carefully defined. A circumstance very unlikely to have occurred had the passage been

fabricated by a later writer at a time when the 'shekel of the Sanctuary' was in common use, and its weight well-known.*

2. Some of the laws *expressly referring to their life in the wilderness* require the offering of 'turtle doves or young pigeons,' (Lev.xiv.22), which could not have been obtained there, but which were common in Palestine.

This also has been discussed before (Hist. Charact. Pent. p.145 note). The laws in question were made just before the departure of the Israelites for Mount Seir and Kadesh-barnea, and do not hence refer to the wilderness of Sinai. Doves are mentioned in several places as *characteristic* of desert places (Ps.lv.6-7, Jer. xlviii.28, Ezek.vii.16), one of which was very close to the localities just mentioned (Jer.xlviii.28, the desert of Moab), where also, therefore, they probably occurred in sufficient numbers for the few cleansed lepers who required them as thankofferings. The probability that a later writer, wishing to compose laws on such a subject for the guidance of those of his *own time*, should studiously frame them as if intended for the *camp* in the wilderness (Lev.xiii.46,xiv.3,8), is small indeed.

3. In Ex.x.19 it is said that a '*west wind*' took away the locusts and cast them into the Red Sea. The original Hebrew is 'wind of the sea,' that is a wind blowing from the Mediterranean, which lies on the west of Canaan. Such a phrase could not, therefore, have been originated by Moses, or indeed been used by him to describe a west wind, in Egypt, where the Mediterranean lies on the north.

There can be no doubt but that this term for 'west' must have originated in the land of Canaan, and not in Egypt; that it must therefore be later than the Exodus by no means follows.

* If an Act of Parliament were discovered, in some future age, which made mention of some particular measure to be used in the excise and custom's levies, and accompanied this mention with a careful definition of its exact *size;* which measure it appeared could not have been in use *before*, from the tax in question never having been hitherto levied; would this be regarded as a proof, that the act in question was a mere traditionary representation of something that occurred centuries before its own composition? Would it not rather be looked upon as a strong point of internal evidence in favour of its authenticity and genuineness? Let Antiquarians and Historical Critics decide.

Abraham and his descendants had resided in Canaan for 215 years before Jacob went down into Egypt, during which time they must have spoken some language or other, and had some name for 'west.' They certainly did not speak the same language as the Egyptians (see Gen.xlii.23), nor did their descendants after the Exodus. It may hence be regarded as morally certain, that the language spoken by Moses and the Israelites was the same (substantially) with that of their forefathers, as indeed all its affinities clearly indicate. This word for 'west,' then, was doubtless an old established one, which would be naturally used in every case where 'west' had to be defined, quite irrespectively of its primary meaning. Both senses were indeed retained, but not necessarily both together. Thus when it is said in Nu.xi.31 that 'there went forth a wind from Jehovah, and brought quails *from the sea*,' we are certainly not to suppose a 'west wind,' since we are expressly told in Ps.lxxviii.26 that it was a *south-easterly* one, which indeed the position of the place would require.* While when we read again in Nu.xxxiv.6 that their 'western boundary' was to be 'the great sea,' we certainly have no ground for supposing such an absurd tautology to have been meant, as that their '*seaward* boundary' should be 'the *sea*.' It is clear, then, that according to the usage of the Pentateuch, the wind spoken of in Ex.x.19, may have been a 'west-wind,' or a 'sea wind,' but cannot be pressed as necessarily a 'west wind from the sea.' Curiously enough *either* alternative will suit the context. The 'field of Zoan,' where the plagues descended, was unquestionably the most seaward portion of Lower Egypt, which lay to the North-west of the Red Sea, and between it and the Mediterranean. A wind, therefore, which should carry the locusts out of this part of

* Ps.lxxviii. was certainly written during the reign of David (see p.78), about the same time therefore (according to Bishop Colenso) as the passage in Numbers. The explanation of this difference in two contemporary and probably intimate writers (supposing, that is, that Bishop Colenso's theory about the necessary identity of 'west' and 'seaward' is correct) would be a curious point for the exercise of his ingenuity.

Egypt, and cast them into the Red Sea, *must* have blown from the North-west, and might be fitly described, either as a 'west-wind' (in respect of its general direction with regard to the whole land of Egypt), or a 'sea-wind' (in respect of its source, and appearance at Zoan-Tanis). Though, therefore, the double sense, on which Bishop Colenso's objection rests, is critically untenable, and therefore to be rejected, in this particular passage it would be precisely the most accurate imaginable. While that a writer in the land of Canaan, who judged of the Geography of Egypt by that of his own country, should have on this account selected a *west* wind which blew *away from* the sea, as the most appropriate instrument for carrying these traditionary locusts into the Red Sea, which lay due *south*, is utterly incredible.

4. In Gen.xli.6 the *east*-wind is spoken of as a *parching* wind, which it is in Palestine, but not in Egypt; whence the Septuagint in that place read *south* wind instead of east.

A south wind is unquestionably the most destructive and parching wind in Egypt, though probably the northern parts, between the Red Sea and the Mediterranean (where Zoan and Rameses were) would be exposed to the evil effects of the east wind as well, which is as destructive in Arabia as in Palestine.* It is probable, also, that the phrase 'east wind' had become, from constant use in Canaan, synonymous with 'parching wind', and might therefore be naturally used of any such wind, from whatever direction it blew.† This might seem a sufficient explanation

* See Niebuhr's 'Description of Arabia,' p.8.

† Of the passages where the east-wind is thus spoken of, in respect to its characteristic dryness, and without regard (apparently) to its direction, the following may be especially noted. Ezek.xvii.10, 'Shall it not utterly wither, when the east wind toucheth it?', xix.12, 'The east wind dried up her fruit' (comp. also Job,xv.2,xxxviii.24,Is.xxvii.8,Jer.xviii.17,Hos.xiii.15, Jon.iv.8). The east wind is also frequently noticed as a *tempestuous* wind very destructive to ships (see Job,xxvii.21,Ps.xlviii.7,Ezek.xxvii.26), called now a 'Levanter', and which, Dr. Shaw remarks, blows from all quarters between the North, East, and South, though generally and properly an east wind, while in every case the *same name* is applied to it without qualification (Shaw's Travels, p.330).

for the apparent inaccuracy before us; the reading of the Septuagint, however, (which curiously enough is found *wherever* the east wind is mentioned in the Pentateuch; Ex.x.13,xiv.21) suggests a still more satisfactory one. Does the Hebrew word קָדִים necessarily mean *east?* That this is its general sense is manifest from its being used in such passages as Gen.xiii.14, xxviii.14,Nu.ii.3,iii.38,x.5, &c., in enumerating the four cardinal points, east, west, north and south. That it is often used, however, in a larger sense is equally clear; as the following passages will show. (1). In Gen.xxv.6, it is said that Abraham sent away the children of his concubines 'eastward, unto the east country'. The actual places where they went seem to have lain between the east and the *south*, since Arabia (including the Sinaitic desert, which lay due south) appears to have been their chief abode. (2.) In Hos.xiii.15 the 'east wind' is spoken of as synonymous with 'wind of the desert', which would certainly include the south and south-east as well. (3.) In Ezek.xlvii.18, Joel,ii.20,Zech.xiv.8 the Persian gulf is styled the 'eastern sea', in opposition to the 'hindmost' or Mediterranean sea. Its true direction was *south-east*. (4.) In Ps.lxxviii.26 we read, 'He caused an *east* wind to blow in the heaven; and by his might he brought in a *south* wind.' The regular parallelism between each pair of expressions in this Psalm (as, indeed, in Hebrew poetry generally), compels us to regard the 'east wind' of the first clause as identical with the 'south wind' of the second. (Compare also the latter part of the last note). It is, therefore, quite probable that the author of Gen.xli.6 intended a *southerly* wind by his קָדִים, and not an easterly, selecting this word to designate it merely on account of its character, without respect to its direction.

5. In Gen.xiv.14 Abraham is said to have pursued the fugitive kings 'unto Dan,' a place which first received that name after the death of Joshua, as recorded in Josh.xix.47,Jud.xviii. During the lifetime of Moses and

Joshua it was known as Laish; so that the passage in question could not have been written until some time afterwards.*

That the Dan here intended is the same with the subsequently famous one, which constituted the northern limit of the Jewish territory, as Beersheba did the southern, seems tolerably clear; though of course it is quite possible, that there might have been some place of that name towards the north of Palestine in the days of Abraham, of which we have no further mention. Granting, however, that it is the ancient Laish which is here intended, it by no means follows that the narrative where it is mentioned is to be assigned to a later date than Moses and Joshua. Internal evidence would certainly lead us to the contrary conclusion. Gen.xiv. contains several ancient names of places, which seem to have quite gone out of fashion when the rest of the Pentateuch was written,—'Bela' for 'Zoar' (*v.*2,8), 'the vale of Siddim' for 'the salt sea' (*v.*3), 'En-Mishpat' for Kadesh (*v.*7),—but which were clearly those commonly known to its author (comp. *v.*8). He alludes also to another place (the valley of Shaveh) by a different name from that by which it was known in later times, and especially in the reign of David (comp. *v.*17 with 2Sam. xviii.18); calls also the Amorite inhabitants of Seir and the neighbouring mountains by their distinctive titles (*v.*5-6, comp. Deut.ii.10-2,20). The whole narrative, in fact, has an air of antiquity, and also of non-jewish origin about it, as if it were a fragment of some ancient book of histories belonging to another nation, engrafted here on account of its connection with Abraham. It has clearly, also, been retouched by a later writer, who has added the explanatory notes to the ancient names above considered. That such a narrative, as originally written, should

* This objection more properly belongs to a later section, where the evidence to be deduced from names of places will be discussed at length; it is however in many respects an exceptional case, and may therefore perhaps be better discussed by itself.

have contained any mention of the Israelitish Dan is most improbable therefore. That, had it made mention of Laish, this would either have been explained or altered, to shew its identity with Dan, may be regarded as certain. The only difficulty lies in the fact, that in all the other cases the older names have been explained, here only (we must suppose) *changed* for their more modern representatives. This may, however, be accounted for on the ground of the great notoriety of Dan, and more especially of the existence of *another Laish* in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem (Is.x.30). At any rate, the uncertainty which rests over the introduction of this name, must preclude its occurrence here being used as an argument for the later origin of this chapter, which contains so many marks of antiquity.

6. In Gen.xxxvi.31-9 a list of Edomite kings is given, who reigned, it is said, 'before there reigned any king over the children of Israel'. This expression seems to imply that at the time when the list was written there *was* a king over Israel, as no earlier writer would be likely to make use of so vague and purposeless a definition of time.

This seems, indeed, to be the only fair conclusion which can be drawn from the words, in spite of all the ingenious devices of orthodox critics to evade it, and ascribe the list to Moses. It must have been written, it would seem, during the reign of Saul, since David (we read) subdued Edom to himself (2Sam.viii.14), a circumstance which must certainly have been mentioned, had the list extended so far. How then came it in the Pentateuch?*

We have already noticed the characteristic opening of the chapter, 'These are the annals of Esau' (*v.*1), repeated with slight variation in *v.*9; and classed it on that account among the older Elohistic sections of the book of Genesis, with which well agree such little details of hoar antiquity as those recorded of Anah (Esau's father-in-law) and his asses (*v.*24). These 'annals'

* It is found besides in 1Chr.i.43-51, but this was clearly copied from Genesis; since not only this list, but the *whole chapter* is (substantially) repeated (see *v.*35-54).

consist of genealogies, and lists of 'chieftains' (אַלּוּפִים), first of Esau and his sons (*v.*1-19), and then of Seir the Horite and his sons (*v.*20-30). Here suddenly the strain alters, and we have the list of 'kings,' (מְלָכִים), who 'reigned in the land of Edom' &c.; not given in the form of genealogies or lists as before, but in the regular succession of chronology,—one king reigned, he died, another reigned in his stead, &c. This continues from *v.*30 to 39, eight kings in all. Then, as suddenly, the old strain is resumed, and in *v.*40-3 we have a yet further list of 'chieftains' descended from Esau, finishing with the characteristic verse, 'These are the chieftains of Edom, according to their habitations, in the land of their possession; the same is Esau the father of Edom' (*v.*43, comp.*v.*9,19,30). The passage in *v.*30-9 is clearly, then, an *interpolation*, closely connected in subject, indeed, with the rest of the chapter, so as fully to account for its insertion, but very different in style and phraseology. But if so, then it is plain, that the bulk of the chapter must be of much *earlier* date than Saul; since the reigns of eight kings cannot have occupied much less than a century, and we do not know what space of time may have elapsed between the last mentioned chieftain of *v.*43 and the first king.

7. It is stated in 1Sam.ix.9 that in the days of Samuel the word 'seer' (רֹאֶה) was in common use, in place of the more modern 'prophet' (נָבִיא). The latter word is, however, invariably used in the Pentateuch, the former never; from which it would seem that the passages containing it (Gen.xx.7, Ex.vii.1,xv.20,Nu.xi.29,xii.6,Deut.xiii.1,3,5,xviii.15,18,20,22,xxxiv.10) cannot have been written until *after* the days of Samuel.

If this objection be worth anything at all, it is equally fatal to Bishop Colenso's view of the origin of the Pentateuch, as to that commonly received, since the first passage named (Gen.xx.7) occurs in one of the most distinctly Elohistic sections of the book of Genesis (see p.9), which Bishop Colenso would therefore regard as composed by Samuel himself. If the use of these two words, then, is to be taken as a sign of time, the fair conclusion

would be that the whole Pentateuch, Elohistic and Jehovistic sections as well, was later than the time of Samuel. But is there really any ground for regarding these words as signs of time at all? The passage referred to (1Sam.ix.9) merely says, that 'Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, Come and let us go to the Seer, for he that is now called a Prophet was beforetime called a Seer.' A statement which appears to have been added to the text of the narrative by a later hand, in order to explain the otherwise strange use of the word 'Seer.' It must be borne in mind, however, that it does not say, that the term 'prophet' was *not* used in the days of Samuel, or that 'seer' was an equivalent, and at the same time more ancient, appellation; it merely says that 'such an one as, in the writer's time, was called a prophet, was formerly (*i.e.* in the days of Samuel) called a seer.' For, in point of fact, in this very book of Samuel 'prophet' is the commoner word of the two (1Sam. iii.20,x.5,10,11,12,xix.20,24). The word 'seer' is found besides three times in Chronicles, and once in Isaiah. From which facts alone it is clear, that no conclusion as to date can be founded upon the occurrence of the two words.

Let us now endeavour to ascertain somewhat of their meaning and usage, and see what light may thus be thrown upon this curious diversity. The Hebrew for prophet (נָבִיא) is derived from the verb נָבָא which means to 'prophesy,' and has (according to Gesenius) three principal shades of meaning, (1.) to declare oracles, or speak as God's interpreter, or agent; (2.) to predict future events (in the name of God); (3.) to chant or sing in the worship of God. These distinctions appear equally in the derived substantive נָבִיא, which may be, (1.) an interpreter or mouthpiece to God, in the same way that Aaron was to be unto Moses (Ex.vii.1,comp.iv.16,Jer.xv.19); (2.) a peculiar friend of God, and so entrusted with his secrets, and acquainted with his will (Gen.xx.7,Ps.cv.15); (3.) an inspired teacher, and predicter of future events (Dt.xiii.1-2); (4.) a chanter, minstrel, or poet (Ex.

xv.20,1Sam.x.5,10,11,12,xix.20,24). The word is therefore clearly a *generic* one, embracing several classes of persons, and defining nought concerning them except their inspiration. The Hebrew for 'seer' is רֹאֶה, and is derived from the verb רָאָה to 'see'. Its meaning is plain, therefore, 'a seer of visions'; it is also sometimes used of the vision itself (Is.xxviii.7). The word is strictly *specific*, referring to one class of prophets only, and having respect to the *manner* in which the divine message was communicated to them. A brief examination of the passages containing these two words, in the Pentateuch and book of Samuel, will shew how this difference of meaning accounts for the otherwise strange divergence of usage between them. When God told Abimelech that Abraham was a 'prophet' (Gen.xx.7), he manifestly referred to his intimate acquaintance and relation to Himself; 'seer' would have been quite out of place. Ex.vii.1, where Aaron is called Moses' 'prophet,' in regard to Pharaoh, has been already noticed; to have used 'seer' here was clearly impossible. Miriam, Moses' sister, is styled a 'prophetess' in Ex.xv.20, no doubt as an *inspired songstress;* here again 'seer' would have been quite inappropriate. Nu.xi.29, where Moses says, 'would that all Jehovah's people were prophets, that Jehovah would give his spirit unto them,' doubtless refers to similar manifestations of inspiration. He certainly did not mean that all the people should *see visions.* In Nu.xii.6-8, God is distinguishing between his revelation of himself to Moses and to others. 'If there be a prophet among you, I Jehovah will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream' &c. where also 'seer' would have been out of place, as not sufficiently *comprehensive.* And the same may be said of Deut.xiii.1,3,5, where the people are warned against lying prophets, and therefore the whole class were required to be named, not merely one section of them. Deut.xviii.15-22 contains the promise of a prophet like unto Moses, to whom the people should look for divine commands. The connection of this promise with

the request of the people at Horeb, that God would not speak to them himself any more, but would speak *through* Moses instead (*v.*16-9), clearly required נָבִיא the interpreter or mouthpiece, not רֹאֶה the seer of visions. Lastly, in Deut.xxxiv.10 it is said, that 'there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses.' Here certainly 'seer' might have been employed, as the 'open vision' vouchsafed to Moses was one of his most notable excellencies (Nu.xii.8,Dt.xxxiv.10). Yet was 'prophet' the more appropriate, as including far more than 'seer.' Not only was Moses the greatest seer of visions that Israel had known when these words were penned, but he was also the greatest of all God's interpreters, the chiefest of his friends, the noblest of his inspired poets. Once only in the Pentateuch, then, could 'seer' have been employed, and there far less appropriately than 'prophet'; its absence has been thoroughly accounted for in every case. We turn now to the usage in 1 Samuel. How came it that this specific title was thus applied to Samuel, so distinctively indeed, as to be only thrice used of any one else (2Sam.xv.27,2Ch.xvi. 7,Is.xxx.10)? The answer is very simple. Revelation by *vision* had become extinct in those days, the prophetic Spirit little known, except in hymns and chants. 'The word of God was precious in those days, there was *no open vision*' (1Sam.iii.1). Such revelation was vouchsafed to *Samuel*. Like Moses he talked with God 'face to face' (iii.21,ix.15, &c.), and even in childhood was established before all Israel as a prophet (iii.20). Other prophets there were, ay, whole schools of prophets, who chanted and sang before Jehovah under Samuel's direction (1Sam.xix.20). To none of these, however, were such revelations vouchsafed as to Samuel, and so this pre-eminence obtained for him the distinctive title of 'the Seer.'* After his time the name was still occasionally employed, but as might have been expected, but rarely of others

* Samuel is spoken of as 'the Seer' in 1Sam.ix.11,18,19,1Ch.ix.22,xxix. 29, once also as a 'prophet' 1Sam.iii.20.

beside himself. The state of things which had brought the word into such prominence passed away, as prophets multiplied and visions grew familiar. 'Seer' was no longer the honourably distinctive title it had been, and men naturally recurred to the older and more comprehensive 'prophet'; so that by the end of David's reign the specific title was little known and seldom used. This seems to be the simplest, and also the most scriptural explanation, which presents itself, of the varying usage of these two names.

8. In Nu.xxi.14-5 there is a quotation from the 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah' introduced to illustrate the statement, that 'Arnon was the boundary of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites' (*v.*13). No contemporary writer would have cared to record such a notorious fact as this, neither could he have made such a quotation from a song composed at the most some few weeks previous, and which clearly refers to transactions long past.

In making this objection, Bishop Colenso seems to have forgotten, that the river Arnon continued to the be boundary of Moab for many centuries after this; and so *whenever* the passage was written, it must have been a fact 'notorious' to all the people. A similar statement is made in Jud.xi.18, when Jepthah remonstrates with the king of Ammon concerning his claim upon this very territory, and tells him how the Israelites 'came by the east side of the land of Moab, and pitched on the other side of Arnon, but came not within the border of Moab; for *Arnon was the border of Moab.*' A very 'notorious' fact, certainly, to both parties, since Jepthah reminds the king, that Arnon had been their border now for 300 years (*v.*26). The special way in which the border is described in the passage before us, 'between Moab and *the Amorites*,' would certainly favour its Mosaic origin. In Judges, it will be observed, no such expression occurs. With respect to the quotation, it may, not improbably, have been added by a later writer, desirous of throwing light upon the history. The narrative certainly reads more naturally without it. The 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah' would seem to have been a poem (probably contemporaneous) composed in record of the wonders of the

forty years' wilderness-sojourn of the Israelites. Bishop Colenso says, indeed, that the song 'must have been written long after the days of Moses.' For this, however, the fragment before us certainly gives no warrant. The expressions on which he bases his assertion, 'What he did in the Red Sea, and in the brooks of Arnon' (*v.*14), even as thus translated (E.V.), imply nothing of the kind, since every memorial song, however contemporaneous, *must* refer to the events spoken of as *past*. In De Wette's and Benisch's translations, however, even this meagre sign of time disappears, the word rendered 'he did,' being regarded by them as a proper name. 'Waheb in Sufa, and the brooks of Arnon.' The meaning of the passage certainly becomes more obscure by this alteration, since it reduces it to a mere catalogue of names. It agrees, however, far better with the Hebrew original, which fixes both 'Waheb' (וָהֵב) and 'brooks' as *accusatives*, by the prefixed particle אֵת. (So also Gesenius).

9. In several places in Genesis (xxxix.14,17,xl.15,xli.12) the descendants of Abraham are spoken of as 'Hebrews,' as if they were already a well known race, so much so indeed, that even the land of Canaan could be spoken of by Joseph as 'the land of the Hebrews', and his meaning be readily understood by the Egyptians to whom he was speaking.

Everything here depends upon the origin of the title so applied. It has been referred by some to 'Heber' the great-grandson of Shem, and distant progenitor of Abraham; but this is certainly improbable. It would have been far more natural to have called them after Terah, or Abraham himself, than to have gone back six generations in search of an appropriate name. The derivation from the verb עָבַר to 'cross, or pass over', in reference to their *crossing* the Euphrates, is far more probable. Such a title might very naturally have been given them by the Canaanites and other nations amongst whom they sojourned. Bishop Colenso, indeed, while admitting the propriety of this derivation, would prefer to refer the 'crossing' to the passage of the Jordan (Part II., p. 351), but against this several reasons may be urged. (1.) The Israelites possessed *both* sides of the Jordan; which

would render the title, if so derived, inappropriate, as not applying to the whole people. (2.) The title must have been given them by those into whose land they crossed, not by themselves; but that they should have adopted a name given them by the doomed and conquered people of Canaan, as their national and distinctive title, is most improbable. (3.) The crossing of the Jordan was remarkable for the miracle by which it was accomplished, that of the Euphrates for the *national distinctness* which it conferred upon the house of Abraham, the latter therefore would be by far the most likely to be referred to in a national name. Joshua, in his epitomy of their history (xxiv.2-13) *begins* with the passage of the Euphrates. But if the name originated in this way, then to find it in the mouths of Egyptians and others, as the only name by which for a long time the people were known, is exactly what we should expect; to have found any other would have been an anachronism. And accordingly, not only does the title occur in the passages referred to above, but in several others; in Gen.xiv. 13 ('Abram the Hebrew') written probably, as already remarked, by some foreign writer of great antiquity (p.95); in Gen.xliii.32, Ex.i.15,16,19,ii.6,7,11,13,iii.18,v.3,vii.16,ix.1,13,x.3,xxi.2, &c.; nearly always, it may be observed, as the name by which they were known to foreigners, rather than that by which they called themselves. Nor is it to be wondered at, that their name and abode should have been well known in Egypt before Jacob's journey thither. When we remember the size and importance of the patriarchal households, the long time of their sojourn in Canaan, the mighty deeds with which their name had been connected in the days of Abraham, his visit to Egypt in time of famine, coupled with the continual intercourse existing between Egypt and Canaan, and the marked difference of race and language between the Hebrews and the Canaanites,—when we remember all this, we certainly cannot wonder, that the title should have been familiar and well known in Egypt when Joseph was sold there. Had a later writer, loosely recording his own version of well-nigh

forgotten traditions, composed the narrative, the 'land of *Israel*' would have been a far more likely phrase for him to have employed.

10.* In Gen.xii.6,xiii.7 it is noted, that at the time of the events narrated 'the Canaanite dwelt in the land', implying, therefore, that at the time of the writer this was *no longer the case*.

Some have supposed that this was said by way of contrast to a *previous* state of things (unrecorded anywhere), when the Canaanites had not yet possessed themselves of Palestine. This is, however, unnatural and purposeless, besides being less accordant with the true meaning of the Hebrew word (אָז) for 'then'. The words were doubtless written, as Bishop Colenso argues, after the conquest of Canaan, and the settlement of the tribes. A moment's glance at the context, however, will shew that both statements are of the nature of explanatory notes, interrupting the narrative, and therefore probably added by a later hand than the original (Jehovist) writer. The passages will speak for themselves. Gen.xii.5-7 'And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all the substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and they came into the land of Canaan. And Abram passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the terebinth of Moreh. (And the Canaanite was then in the land.) And Jehovah appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land' &c. Gen.xiii.7-8. 'And there was a quarrel between the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle. (And the Canaanite and the Perizzite abode then in the land.) And Abram said unto Lot' &c. *When* these additions were made to the original narrative it is of course impossible to say.

11. In Ex.xvi.35-6, it is said, 'And the children of Israel did eat manna

---

* This and the four following are classed by Bishop Colenso as '*additional* signs of later date', less conclusive, he admits, than those already considered.

forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna until they came unto the extremity of the land of Canaan. Now the omer is a tenth of the ephah.' These words could not have been written until the forty years were over, since the manna did not cease till after the passage of the Jordan (Josh.v.12); nor the last clause until the 'omer' (a very different measure from the 'homer', which measured *ten* ephahs instead of a *tenth*) had gone out of common use, which must have been some time afterwards.

Both of these propositions may readily be granted, since there can be little doubt but that these verses are a later addition to the original narrative. The latter certainly must be, since had the whole been written at a time when the 'omer' had gone out of use, it surely would not have been spoken of so familiarly and without explanation in the main narrative, as a measure well known and possessed by all; a strong argument, by the way, for its early origin. This being so, the preceding verse, about the duration of the supply, may very probably be part of the same addition, if there seems reason for assigning the rest of the chapter to the sojourn in the wilderness; if not, it might be regarded as part of the original narrative. There is nothing in itself to decide the point.

12. In Lev.xviii.28 we read, 'That the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, *as it spued out the nations which were before you*'; implying that the Canaanites were already exterminated when these words were written.

It is to be remembered that in Hebrew there are but *two* tenses, past and present (or future). To keep up, therefore, the distinction of time required here, there was absolutely *no alternative* but to speak of the judgment upon the Canaanites as *past*, which, in regard to the future judgments upon the Israelites, it certainly was. To have put both clauses in the future would have been very incongruous. 'That the land may not spue you out also, when ye shall defile it, as it *shall spue out* the nations which were before you'. Whenever, therefore, the passage was written, this form of expression must have been employed, to convey the sense required. Still further to establish this, it may be well to refer to a couple of parallel cases, where a similar change of tense

occurs. Gen.ii.17, 'In the day that thou didst eat (lit.) thereof, thou shalt surely die', where we surely cannot imagine the writer to have selected the past tense because of the action being in his days past (since then *both* should have been past), but simply to express the difference of time between the two acts spoken of. Gen.ix.6, 'He that did shed (lit.) man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.' This certainly does not imply that the blood-shedding referred to had already taken place when the words were written, yet it is spoken of in the past tense. Passages of this kind might be multiplied without limit.

13. In Nu.xv.32-6, there is an account of the judgment upon the Sabbath-breaker, which is introduced with the expression, '*while the children of Israel were in the wilderness*,' thereby implying that at the time of the writer they were no longer there.

This is certainly the most natural way of accounting for such an expression being used, though not the only one admissible. An examination of the context, however, will leave little doubt that it is the true one, and that this little piece of narrative was inserted in its present place, *after* the rest of the chapter was written. The chapter is occupied with a series of laws, chiefly intended for the land of Canaan (*v.*2,18), concerning sacrifices and free-will-offerings (*v.*1-16), heave-offerings and sin-offerings, (*v.*17-31), and fringes on their garments (*v.*37-40), each section being headed by the phrase, 'And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, &c. (*v.*1-2,17-8,37-8); and the whole concluding with, 'I am Jehovah your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God; I am Jehovah your God' (*v.* 41). Between the last two sections occurs the narrative in question, thus interrupting the original text with matter of a totally different kind. Nor have we to go far to perceive the reason of its insertion here. The last point insisted upon in the preceding verses is the judgment to be visited upon those who 'scorned the word of Jehovah and made

void his commandments;' 'that soul shall be utterly cut off' (*v.*31). It would not unnaturally occur to a later narrator (if such there were) to illustrate this law, which might be thought, from what had been said before (*v.*2,18), to belong only to the promised land, by showing how it was carried out in the wilderness. The Sabbath-breaker, who had disregarded the spirit of God's commands, without however (as it would seem) incurring any threatened penalty,* presented an appropriate example; and the history was inserted accordingly. This is of course mere conjecture, but it seems the most probable explanation which presents itself; though, as before observed, the difficulty is by no means insuperable on the ordinary view of undivided Mosaic authorship. That a narrative, like this of the sabbath-breaker, should have been preserved by tradition down to the times of David, is most unlikely; that it should have been invented by any writer in his age, and inserted here to illustrate that which no longer needed illustration, is equally improbable. On Bishop Colenso's view, therefore, the difficulty which it presents is still greater, both origin and meaning being alike inexplicable.

14. There are numerous cases where names given to places *after* the conquest of Canaan are used in earlier portions of the narrative (*e.g.* Hebron Gen.xiii.18, Salem Gen.xiv.18 &c.); others too are mentioned familiarly, of which Moses and his Israelites could know scarcely anything (*e.g.* Bethel Gen.xii.8,xiii.3; Zoar Gen.xiii.10), often also both ancient and modern names (Gen.xiv.2,3,7,17,xxiii.2,xxxv.19,27, &c.)

Much may be learnt from the usage of these names of places, in the different sections of the Pentateuch, we shall therefore consider them in detail, merely omitting those in Gen.xiv., which have been already discussed.†

---

* Working or kindling fires on the Sabbath are distinctly forbidden in Ex.xxxi.13-7,xxxv.1-3; the incident referred to belonged therefore probably to the earlier part of their sojourn, before this particular command was given, while yet it was well known that the Sabbath ought to be kept holy (see Ex.xvi.23-30).

† Excepting only 'Salem', which will be considered in chapter x. when the book Joshua comes under discussion.

1. BETHEL, so named by Jacob on account of his vision there, is twice called by this name before the record of that event, Gen.xii.8,xiii.3 (both Jehovistic passages); several times also in connection with Jacob's history, Gen.xxviii.19 (mainly Jehovistic) xxxv.1,3,6,8,15 (Elohistic), in two of which its ancient name 'Luz' is mentioned as well (xxviii.19,xxxv.6); once beside in the Pentateuch with the ancient name alone, Gen.xlviii.3 (Elohistic). It is twice mentioned in Joshua, once in connection with its ancient name (xviii.13), once alone (viii.12); once also in Judges, where its capture by the Ephraimites is recorded, and the old name appears for the last time (i.23). As the name was given by Jacob more than 50 years before his descent into Egypt, and the place was subsequently revisited by him and his sons, and made their abode for some time (Gen.xxxv.1-15), it is not to be wondered at, that it should have been familiar to Moses and his Israelites, and the place been better known to them by that name than by its proper one, Luz. To the generation that went down into Egypt, however, the contrary would be the case; both names would be well known to them, but Luz would certainly be most familiar. Referring again to the passages named above, it cannot but strike one as remarkable, that in the Pentateuch this older name is always associated with the new one in *Elohistic* passages, once indeed occurring alone, but is only once mentioned in *Jehovistic*, and then as the *former* name (before Jacob's vision) rather than the present one (Gen.xxviii.19). It is plain, then, that at the time of the Elohist, *Luz* was the name commonly used, at the time of the Jehovist *Bethel*. These facts leave us but two alternatives as to the respective dates of these diverse sections. Either, the Elohist wrote soon after the descent into Egypt, and the Jehovist some time shortly before the entrance into Canaan; or, the Elohist wrote soon after the passage of the Jordan, and the Jehovist in still later times. That the Elohist wrote in the days of Samuel is out of the question, since surely then he would never have

employed the ancient name for Bethel at all, which must have been quite unknown to the people, and which moreover had been transferred to *another city* in the land of the Hittites, still in existence when the book of Judges was composed (Jud.i.26). That the former of the two alternatives mentioned above is the more probable appears from the following circumstance. In Gen.xxxv.6 it is said 'So Jacob came to Luz, which is in the *land of Canaan* (that is Bethel), he and all the people that were with him.' A very unlikely note of place (mentioned, too, by way of *explanation*) had the narrative been written after the passage of the Jordan. A most natural and appropriate one, if written soon after the descent into Egypt.*

2. ZOAR is mentioned by that name in Gen.xiii.10,xix.20-2 (both Jehovistic passages), in the latter of which its origin is also given, as arising from a saying of Lot, when fleeing from Sodom. The ancient name, Bela, only appears in Gen.xiv.2,8, which has been already considered. The use of the later name in the previous history of Abram and Lot manifestly presents no evidence of date, as it was already 400 years old at the time of the Exodus. The passage itself, however, where it occurs is very important. It is as follows, 'And Lot lifted up his eyes, and saw all the district of the Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before Jehovah destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like the garden of Jehovah, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoar' (Gen. xiii.10). On this Bishop Colenso founds the objection, "what could the Hebrews in the wilderness have known of the nature of the country in the land of Canaan, 'as thou comest unto Zoar,' Gen.xix.22? Or what could Moses himself have known of it?" Very little no doubt, and therefore in describing the former

* The association of Bethel with Ai in Gen.xii.8,xiii.3 (Jehovistic) might also be urged as an argument against the assignment of these passages to so late a date as that of David, since Ai was destroyed by Joshua and remained desolate at least until the book of Joshua was written (viii.28). The place is not mentioned again till after the captivity (Ez.ii.28,Neh.vii.32).

character of the district (not its present, but '*before* Jehovah destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah'), it is compared (1.) to the garden of Eden, and (2.) to the *Land of Egypt*. What now, we may ask, could the people of David's time have known respecting Egypt? what even Nathan or Gad? The comparison would clearly be useless, except made at a time when the people were acquainted with the land of Egypt. A later writer would never have employed it. Bishop Colenso, in fact, has fallen into the mistake of referring the concluding phrase, 'as thou comest unto Zoar' to the second member of the comparison (the illustrat*ive*), instead of to the first (the illustrat*ed*). Grammatically, of course, it might refer, either to 'the district of the Jordan', 'Sodom and Gomorrah', 'the garden of Jehovah', or 'the land of Egypt'. A moment's consideration, however, will convince any one that it can only refer to the first, geographical inconsistency excluding the third and fourth, historical the second. It has hence nothing whatever to do with what the Israelites were expected to know, but with what they did *not* know; to elucidate this the comparison with Egypt was introduced.

3. HEBRON is mentioned in Gen.xiii.18 (Jehovistic) as the name of a district in which the 'terebinths of Mamre' were situated; in xxiii.2,xxxv.27 (both Elohistic) as the later name of the city of Kirjath-Arbah; in xxiii.19 (Elohistic) as the later name of Mamre; in xxv.9 (Elohistic) Mamre is mentioned alone; in xxxvii.14 (Elohistic) the 'vale of Hebron' is mentioned; in Nu.xiii.22 the city of Hebron. Now it appears from the book of Joshua, that there was, at the time of the invasion of Canaan, a king of Hebron, whom Joshua slew at Makkedah, and whose *cities* and country he conquered (x.3,23,36-7,xii.10); which Hebron was clearly, therefore, the name of a district, and not of a particular town. There was also a city of the Anakim, Kirjath-Arbah, subsequently captured by Caleb and the tribe of Judah, and then re-named, probably after the district in which it stood, Hebron (Josh.xiv.13-5,xv.13-4,54,xx.7,xxi.11-13,Jud.i.10,20).

This distinction must be carefully borne in mind, since the first Hebron (the district) must certainly have been known to Moses, and perhaps long before, while the second (the city) did not receive that name until some years after the passage of the Jordan.* The occurrence of 'Hebron' in the first sense (Gen.xiii.18,xxxvii. 14) presents, therefore, no indication of date. In three other cases it is clearly an addition of a later hand (Gen.xxiii.2,19, xxxv.27), while the phrase 'in the land of Canaan', which occurs in the first two, as before fixes the original narrative to have been written before the conquest of the land. These explanatory notes may have been added at any time after the capture of Kirjath-Arbah. One passage only presents a difficulty,—Nu.xiii.22, where in describing the journey of the spies through the land, it is said 'And they went up by the south, and came unto Hebron, where Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai, the children of Anak were. Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt.' This last clause is almost certainly a later addition, as it has no connection whatever with the narrative. It of course refers to the old Kirjath-Arbah. The other part of the verse, however, must certainly be referred to the same hand as the rest of the chapter, while the mention of the three sons of Anak, who held Kirjath-Arbah when Caleb took it, seems to fix the Hebron intended to be the *city*, and not the *district*. If so, then the narrative in Nu.xiii.-xiv. must be assigned to a period considerably later than that of the conquest, since the old name seems to have been familiarly used for some time after the change. It is quite possible, however, that as Kirjath-Arbah undoubtedly stood in the district of Hebron, it may be the *district* that was intended, and not the city; so that the indication here presented, however valuable if corroborated by other evidence, cannot be allowed any

* An exactly parallel case is to be found in *Debir*, which is mentioned in the same terms with Hebron in Josh.x.38-9,xii.13, and clearly as the name of a *district*; while in Josh.xv.15,49,Jud.i.11 we have mention of the city of Kirjath-sepher, conquered by Othniel, and then re-named Debir.

very great weight if standing alone.* It must not be overlooked, that the occurrence of these ancient names, Mamre and Kirjath-Arbah, both utterly unknown in the later historical books †, is a serious objection to Bishop Colenso's theory of the origin of the Pentateuch in the times of Samuel and David.

4. BETHLEHEM is twice mentioned in the Pentateuch as the more modern name for Ephrath, Gen.xxxv.19,xlviii.7 (both Elohistic). We have no information as to the origin of the later name, while the older one continued to be coupled with it long afterwards, to distinguish it from the northern Bethlehem in the tribe of Zebulon (Jud.xvii.9,xix.1-2,18,Ruth.iv.11,1Sam.xvii. 12,Mic.v.2,&c., comp.Josh.xix.15). No argument can therefore be founded upon the occurrence of either name, though the way in which the name Bethelehem is introduced, in the two passages in question, presents another illustration of the explanatory notes appended to the original narrative some time after the entrance into Canaan.

5. HORMAH is mentioned in Nu.xiv.45 as the name of a place to which the Amalekites and Canaanites drove the Israelites, when they attacked their mountain. The name was not given to it, however, until the Israelites conquered the district in the last year of their sojourn in the wilderness (Nu.xxi.3). A conclusive proof that the earlier portions of the narrative were written *after* the later events had transpired, and not at the very time they concern. The city mentioned in Jud.i.17 as formerly called Zephath, but named Hormah on its capture, was in the same neighbourhood, but probably a different place. The other was

---

* It is curious that Bishop Colenso says not a word about this passage, where the evidence of later origin is really strong, but confines himself to Gen.xiii.8, where he endeavours to establish an anachronism by assuming the identity of the Hebron, *in* which stood the terebinths of Mamre, with the *city* whose name 'before was Kirjath-Arbah.'

† Kirjath-Arbah is mentioned in Neh.xi.25, nowhere else in the Bible, beside the passages referred to in the text.

clearly a district; while the meaning of the name ('doomed') would naturally account for its repetition, even without the association of locality.

6. MIZPAH is mentioned as another name for Galeed in Gen. xxxi.48-9. It was most probably added by a later hand. Neither are mentioned again in the Pentateuch; nor have we any clue as to when the later name was introduced.*

We have now considered in detail all the signs of time in the first four books, which Bishop Colenso has adduced in support of his theory. Those on the other side, arising from the minute truthfulness of the history, the precise and familiar acquaintance with Egypt and the wilderness displayed throughout, the lack of system in the arrangement of the collections of laws, and of the books generally, the connection of several of the laws with little incidents in the history which occasioned them,—these have been pointed out before,† and must of course be borne in mind in forming a judgment on the point at issue. Taking, then, all these points of evidence into consideration, with the various objections and explanations to which each are severally open, the following conclusions seem to force themselves upon us, as the necessary result of our inquiries.

(1.) The theory which would ascribe the first four books of the Pentateuch to writers living in the times of Samuel and David is utterly inadequate to explain the phenomena presented by them,

* Besides these signs of time, there is the phrase 'unto this day' on which Bishop Colenso naturally insists, as a proof that the narrative was written some time after the events thus spoken of. As, however, none of the instances on which he builds his argument belong to the first four books, it will not come under notice till further on. In one place in Genesis however it supplies a valuable note of time not to be overlooked. At the close of the account of Joseph's legislation during the famine, Gen.xlvii.13-26, it is said, that 'Joseph made it a statute over the land of Egypt *unto this day*, that Pharaoh should have the fifth part.' This must clearly have been written by some one well acquainted with the laws of Egypt, who lived considerably later than Joseph. The whole passage is probably due to the Jehovist, as it interrupts the regular narrative very manifestly.

† See Hist. Charact. Pent. p. 178-97.

and is directly contrary to many of the indications of time contained in them.

(2.) The difference of date and character between the Elohistic and Jehovistic sections of Genesis is confirmed by several indirect signs of time.

(3.) Some portions of the Elohistic narrative seem to be of greater antiquity than others; all however would seem to have been written before the conquest of Canaan, and some of the later portions probably soon after the descent into Egypt.

(4.) The Jehovistic sections of Genesis were composed while the people were yet familiar with Egypt, and probably before the conquest.

(5.) The narrative in the book of Numbers was written (at least in part) quite at the close of the sojourn in the wilderness, or more probably after the passage of the Jordan.

(6.) The narrative of the Exodus, as a whole, must be regarded as the work of a contemporary; the laws, as recorded in their original form, as first delivered in the wilderness.

(7.) Both Elohistic and Jehovistic narratives have undergone a certain amount of revision, in the way of addition, or perhaps in one or two instances of alteration, since their original composition. These corrections are for the most merely explanatory, and were made some time after the conquest of Canaan. One in particular belonging clearly to the reign of Saul.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TRUE ORIGIN OF THE FIRST FOUR BOOKS.

(BISHOP COLENSO, PART. II., CHAP. VII.—VIII., XI., P. 223—34, 256—66.)

THE last three chapters have been occupied in examining the evidence advanced by Bishop Colenso in support of his theory, that the Elohistic portions of Genesis and Exodus are to be ascribed to Samuel, the remainder of each, with Leviticus and Numbers, to Nathan, Gad, or some other writers of the age of David and Samuel. We have inquired into the use of the distinguishing name, Jehovah, in the formation of proper names, and in the composition of Psalms; we have investigated the characteristics of a particular Psalm, which was thought to present special features of comparison; we have carefully weighed every sign of date that the books themselves presented. And the result has been, that on every point the evidence advanced has lamentably failed to furnish even the smallest support to the theory; nay, rather, that it has recoiled against it, and furnished us with powerful weapons of attack. We started with the presumption, that the books were written in the time of Moses, if not by Moses' own hand; and every step of the argument has brought the substantial truth of this presumption more strongly to light. Some parts indeed were certainly earlier, a few minor additions later; but the existence of these only serves to fix the Mosaic origin of the remainder, the bulk of the books, more strongly and convincingly. It remains now to examine what further positive

evidence exists upon the point at issue, to discuss some questions of detail which would have been out of place before, and then to deduce from the mass of facts thus accumulated the true theory by which they are to be explained.

The first point which presents itself is the testimony of the books themselves, as to the date and origin of the name Jehovah. This we have hitherto kept out of sight, that Bishop Colenso's counter-evidence might have a fair and impartial hearing. That evidence itself has now almost rendered the production of further testimony unnecessary. The usage of the name in the Psalms afforded a strong ground for placing its introduction considerably *before* the time of David. The various proper names compounded with it pointed to the period of the sojourn in Egypt as the most probable time when it originated. The signs of date in the different sections shewed that it must have been in common use at the time of the conquest of Canaan. Here then we might fairly leave the question, and accepting the pre-mosaic origin of the name as settled, proceed to other and dependent points, content that Bishop Colenso's own arguments should here, as elsewhere, have been found amply sufficient to disprove his case. It may, however, be more satisfactory, and it will certainly render our argument more complete, if to the indirect evidence thus afforded, we now add the direct testimony of the Pentateuch itself. It is very simple, and very conclusive.

In Ex.vi.2-3 we read as follows. 'And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Jehovah. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God Almighty (El Shaddai), but by my name, Jehovah, *was I not known* to them.' Nothing can be plainer than this; God had never revealed himself to the patriarchs by this name Jehovah; which was probably therefore entirely unknown to them,* but which now was declared

* We say '*probably* unknown', because it is not said that they were *ignorant* of the name, but merely that it was not *the* name by which God

to be his chosen title, by which henceforth he would be known and worshipped. The same may be gathered, though less decisively, from the earlier message of God to Moses, recorded in Ex.iii. 13-5. 'And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you, and they shall say to me, What is his *name?* what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM; and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, JEHOVAH, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you. *This is my name for ever, and this my memorial unto all generations.*' Here apparently we have the true origin and derivation of the name, the first person 'I am' אֶהְיֶה being changed to the third 'He is' יִהְיֶה which with the change of ' for י became the name, Jehovah יְהוָֹה. But more of this hereafter. It might seem at first sight, indeed, as if it were intended to imply, that here, at the burning bush, this characteristic name of Israel's God was heard for the *first time*, that it had been completely unknown until God was pleased thus to reveal it unto Moses. Against this, however, rises at once the name of Moses' mother, Jochebed, which seems plainly to include the sacred name within it; without mentioning those other more doubtful instances of the same kind in the book of Chronicles (see p. 48-50). If this name be genuine, then it is clear that the name, Jehovah, must have been known to Levi, whose daughter Jochebed was, and so

---

was known to them, which would not necessarily imply their ignorance of it, though it certainly *would* their disuse of it. Thus it might be said, and said with perfect truth, that Jesus is 'not known' to us Christians by his name Messiah, since we scarcely ever use it, and it is but rarely applied to him in the New Testament. But to conclude from this, that we were *unacquainted* with the name, would be unwarrantable. It *may* have been so with the name Jehovah, though on the whole the contrary supposition seems preferable.

have been in use at least 150 years before the mission of Moses. This is certainly a difficulty, though not an insuperable one, as the following considerations will shew. (1.) The statement in Ex.vi. 2-3 is limited to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and says nothing of their descendants, to whom therefore the name, Jehovah, might have been familiarly known, without implying any contradiction. (2.) The intimate contact into which the children of Israel had been brought with the gods of Egypt, with their many names and attributes, might naturally have led them to multiply the names of their God, and also enlarge their conceptions of his attributes, while still retaining the fundamental idea of his unity inviolate. (3.) The contrast with the *mortal, changing* gods of the Egyptians (sacred animals), would be very likely to suggest *eternal, unchangeable self-existence* as the most appropriate attribute on which to form a new name for their God. (4.) Moses' question as to the name by which he should designate God (iii. 13), would seem to imply that there were *many* names which occurred to him, by which God might be called, and he was in doubt which would be most pleasing in His sight. (5.) The way in which the name is introduced by God, in answer to this question, would be as natural if His design had been to *confirm* a name already existing, as if it were to reveal an entirely new one. Nay, in some respects, the former would seem the more probable. The object of Moses' question was that he might use *such* a name as should at once command the people's attention, and gain *credence* for his message; an entirely new one seems inappropriate to such an end. (6.) The form of the word itself must not be overlooked. We have said that it would appear to have been derived from אֶהְיֶה (I am) by a change of the 1st person for the 3rd, and of ' for א. The first of these alterations is natural enough, but the other is hard to account for, since it involves a change of derivation. Two forms of the verb 'to be' were used among the Hebrews, הָיָה and הָוָה, which differed considerably in usage and sense; were agreed, however,

in this, that both might be used to express *existence*, though the former was most commonly employed for that purpose. This former verb (הָיָה) is the one made use of in the expression 'I am'; yet, strange to say, from the *latter* (הָוָה) is derived the name, Jehovah. May not this, perhaps then, be a sign, that the name was not *in fact* derived from the 'I am' at all, but that this latter was enunciated by God to fix the *meaning* which from henceforth was to be attached to the previously invented name? We conclude, therefore, that it is by no means unlikely that the name, Jehovah, may have been known to the Israelites for a long time before the Exodus, though it did not come into common use, or acquire that supremacy over all other names, which it subsequently enjoyed, until authoritatively chosen and confirmed by God himself.* We shall now proceed to apply the conclusions thus arrived at, to the further elucidation of the real point at issue, the date and authorship of the Pentateuch.

And firstly, how do they affect the Elohistic sections of Genesis? These we have already determined to be independent from the Jehovistic as to authorship, and earlier in date (p. 8-39); with the special note, that they must have been written before the conquest of Canaan, and the later portions probably in the land of Egypt (p.114). The fact that the name Jehovah was not authoritatively published until the very year of the Exodus, is strongly confirmatory of this, and places the antiquity of these portions beyond a doubt. If written by Moses at all, they must have been composed, either in the court of Pharaoh, or amidst the wilds of Midian. But in neither of these places could he have obtained

* It may be worth remarking, that the explanation given above, though on the whole the most probable, is not the only one which presents itself. The name of Jochebed ('Jehovah honours') *may* have been given to Amram's wife on account of her being the mother of Moses and Aaron, and so be later than the Exodus. This is however pure assumption; the view advanced in the text has at least *some* foundation in fact, and is therefore (logically) preferable.

the materials for such a work, the genealogies and minute information which especially characterize these sections of the Pentateuch. We may therefore dismiss the idea of his authorship at once, as untenable. When or how they originated must remain a mystery; their author or authors unknown to fame. But they themselves stand forth with even greater authority and more venerable antiquity than before; the oldest part of Scripture, nay, very probably, the most ancient written documents extant. Thus much in general. Let us now look a little more into detail, and see what effect our conclusions, as to the origin of the name Jehovah, will have upon some of the difficulties with which the division of Genesis into Elohistic and Jehovistic sections was beset. One of the chief of these, it will be remembered, was the occasional occurrence of Jehovah in portions of the narrative otherwise purely Elohistic. This we explained as probably the result of a few alterations or additions made by later hands; and this no doubt is, in the greater number of instances, the only admissible explanation. It cannot, however, but occur to one, that as these sections were probably written in Egypt, some of them certainly more than 70 years after Jacob's descent thither (Gen.l.), and as the name Jehovah appears to have been known at the time of Jochebed's birth, or at least 150 years before the Exodus, it is plain that their author *may* have been acquainted with that name, not indeed as the characteristic, covenant name of God, but as *a* name recently introduced, and sanctioned by venerable authority; and may therefore have occasionally used it in his history. Nay more, that it is quite possible that the name may have been known to Jacob himself, and employed by him in the same way. Perhaps the occurrence of Jehovah in Gen.xlix.18, where Jacob in the midst of his blessing to his sons, exclaims 'I hope for thy aid Jehovah', may be best accounted for in this way, as an interpolation or alteration in such a passage is certainly improbable. And then with regard to the other cases, not explicable in this way, how strikingly does the occurrence of expla-

natory notes respecting the names of places (p.108-13) vindicate the probability of a few alterations in the Divine Names having been made in the same way. A revision of the Elohistic sections by a later hand was at first a mere assumption, made to alleviate the difficulties in the way of our view of the constitution of Genesis, and without any evidence in its favour, except the still greater difficulties which the denial of that view seemed to involve. Now it is an established fact, supported by numerous and conclusive arguments. That the same hand which appended the geographical notes to Gen.xiv.2,3,7,8,17 and inserted the name of Dan in *v.*14, should have added a Jehovah to Abraham's oath in *v.*22; or that the inserter of the more modern 'Mizpah' in the beginning of Gen.xxxi.49, should have altered the Elohim immediately following into Jehovah, is certainly not to be wondered at. Equally clear again would be the reason for inserting a Jehovah in Gen.xxi.33 where it is recorded that Abraham 'called upon the name of the *everlasting* God,' when the meaning of that name is borne in mind.* But to return from this digression to the subject immediately in hand, the date and origin of the name Jehovah as set forth in the Pentateuch, and its connection with the results previously arrived at.

So far as the Elohistic sections of Genesis are concerned the two appear to harmonize remarkably with one another. Let us now turn to the Jehovistic, and see what light may be thrown upon them by the fresh information now before us. So far as the question of *date* goes all is consistent enough. Later than the Elohistic portions, yet written by one well acquainted with Egypt, the period of time from the Exodus to the settlement of the tribes in Canaan answers all the requirements exactly. When, however, we turn from the question of date to that of matter, an apparent

---

* The other instances of the occurrence of Jehovah in Elohistic sections have been explained before (see p.37).

difficulty at once presents itself, on which Bishop Colenso has laid great stress. It is as follows :—

The name, Jehovah, first came into common use after the mission of Moses, and it is expressly stated that God had *not* employed this name in his intercourse with the Patriarchs (Ex.vi.2-3). Yet it is put by the story into the mouths of Eve (Gen.iv.1), of Lamech (v.29), of Noah (ix.26), of Abraham (xiv.22,xv.2,8,xxiv.3,7.), of Sarah (xvi.2,5), of Lot (xix.14), of Eliezer the Damascene (xxiv.12,27,35,40,42,44,48,56), of Laban (xxiv.31,50,51,xxx.27, xxxi.49), of Isaac (xxvi.22,xxvii.27), of the Philistines (xxvi.28,29), of Jacob (xxvii.20,xxviii.16,21,xxx.30,xlix.18), of Leah (xxix.32,33,35), of Rachel (xxx.24). It is represented as the name by which God was worshipped as early as the days of Enos, Adam's grandson (Gen.iv.26), by Noah (viii.20), by Abraham (xii.7,8,xiii.4,xxi.33), and by Isaac (xxvi.25). Nay more, it is several times put into the mouth of God himself, as the name by which he *did* reveal himself to the Patriarchs (xv.7,xviii.19,xxii.16,xxviii.13). A narrative which makes such habitual mistakes on so vital a point as this, cannot be regarded as historically true; and this involves at once the historical truth of all the other statements of the Jehovist.

That we have here a plain and unmistakeable anachronism is indisputable. That this affects the veracity of the history generally, is by no means so self-evident. We have already pointed out the fallacy of such reasoning, which would conclude, from a mere error in the use of *names*, the non-reliability of a narrative in respect to *facts* (see Introduction p.ix.-x.). And we then instanced two cases, exactly similar to the one now before us, where it would be manifest folly to argue in this way,—the use of 'Jew' as a name for the ancient Israelites, and the substitution of 'Lord' for the Hebrew 'Jehovah';—to which we might add the use of 'God' (derived from the Teutonic word for 'good' and therefore certainly later than the overthrow of Paganism) as an equivalent for 'Elohim.' It certainly is as great an anachronism for us to put God and Lord into the mouths of the ancient Israelites from Abraham to Malachi, instead of Elohim and Jehovah, or their English equivalents 'the Terrible' and 'the Eternal,' as it was for the author of the Jehovistic sections of Genesis to put Jehovah into the mouths of the Patriarchs, instead of Elohim or Shaddai. Will then Bishop Colenso argue

that the whole of our English translation, of the Vulgate, of the Septuagint, ay, and of nearly every other version extant, is worthless and unveracious, because the translators were guilty of anachronisms in their renderings of these two names? Or to come nearer home yet;—Bishop Colenso himself frequently speaks of Samuel choosing Jehovah as the most appropriate name for the Living GOD of Israel, when yet it is certain that no such name as 'God', or anything at all approaching to it was known to Samuel.* Will he be prepared to carry out his argument here, as in the Pentateuch, and say that the truth of *all* his statements are involved in the falsity of this? But passing by this self-evident fallacy, let us examine the phenomena before us a little more closely. For though anachronisms in names are, as we have said, no proof of general non-veracity, yet as signs of time they are of considerable importance. The question now before us therefore is, whether the habitual use of Jehovah in a history of the patriarchal age is inconsistent with its Mosaic origin? Or in other words, does the anachronism before us involve any greater difficulties, if the narrative be supposed to have been written shortly after the Exodus, than it would if assigned to a still later period? The great difficulty, that the writer must have committed the anachronism *knowingly*, aware that Jehovah could not have been used in the way he represented, is manifestly the *same* whichever alternative we adopt. Whenever the compiler of Genesis lived, he certainly had the story of the introduction of Jehovah before him, whether it were in the time of David or in that of Moses. Nay more, he had the Elohistic documents concerning that period, of which he was continually availing himself for information or extracts, constantly before him to remind him of the fact, that in those days of which he wrote, Jehovah was a

* It is hardly possible to suppose two names more opposite in signification than Elohim and God; the one being the personification of 'fear' and 'dread', the other of 'goodness' and 'love'.

name unknown.* It may seem strange to us, that a writer under such peculiar circumstances should have employed the name as he has; but so it is, and the strangeness is not in any way lessened by assigning his labours to a later date. Thus far, then, the balance of evidence is strictly even. We shall now proceed to detail a few reasons which render it *more* likely that the writer lived in the times of Moses and Joshua than in those of Samuel and David. And 1st, it is to be observed, that the use of Jehovah in the Jehovistic sections of Genesis is all but exclusive, therein closely resembling the later portions of the Pentateuch, but differing markedly from the usage both of the Psalms and of the History of the latter period, where Elohim is used far more freely (see p.76-82). Then 2nd, it must be remembered, that at the time of the Exodus the name was new, and there was a liability of the people imagining that the new *name* implied a new *God*. In no way could this better be corrected than by using that name in the history of the Patriarchs. All that was said was substantially true, since assuredly Jehovah did do all the things that are ascribed to him in Genesis, and was truly worshipped by the Patriarchs, though not under that name. While as no one would suppose, that the dialogues and speeches were meant to represent more than the general sense of what was spoken, and not the very words themselves, the anachronism would be quite justifiable.† It is very probable that the

* There is one curious point of indirect evidence as to the non-use of Jehovah in patriarchal times, which appears in the *Jehovistic* narrative, and is therefore worth noticing for a moment. In Gen.xvi.11 the origin of the name Ishmael is given. 'Thou shalt call his name Ishmael, because *Jehovah* hath heard thy affliction.' The meaning of Ishma-el is '*Elohim* heareth.' Had 'Jehovah' been the name *actually used* by the angel, it would surely have been Ishma-jah not Ishma-el.

† In the same way the Apostles would teach their disciples the identity of the Saviour and Guide of the Israelites with the Saviour and Guide of Christians, by speaking of things as done unto *Christ* or by him, which in the history are said to have been done by or unto *Jehovah*, &c. (see 1Cor.x. 4,9,Heb.xi.26).

coupling of the two names together in the first Jehovistic section in Genesis (ii.4-iii.) was done especially with this end in view, to show their identity. In further confirmation of this, it is to be noticed, 3rd, that when the name Jehovah was first proclaimed by God, it was specially associated with the names of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Ex.iii.15,16,iv.5), which might naturally lead to its adoption in the record of their history. While lastly, it must not be overlooked, that it is far less likely that a writer in David's days, when both names were well known and regarded as pretty well synonymous, and there would hence be no *object* in employing Jehovah rather than Elohim,—it is far less likely that a writer in David's days, should have ventured upon such an anachronism, than Moses himself, to whom the revelation of the new name had been made, or one who wrote under his direction and with his approval. It appears thus, that the habitual use of Jehovah in the records of the Patriarchal age is, on the whole, more readily explicable on the supposition of their Mosaic origin that on any other.

To dwell upon the agreement between the facts elucidated in this chapter, and the Jehovistic character of the story of the Exodus, and the laws and addresses of Moses, is quite unnecessary. The connection between the deliverance out of Egypt and the name, Jehovah, with the peculiar stress which is thus laid upon it, in a way unknown to later writers, is everywhere manifest. Forty times does the phrase 'I am Jehovah', occur in the three central books, solitary and unconnected with the context, as the confirmation of every law, the seal of every message; seventeen times also in connection with the deliverance out of Egypt, as if it were *this* which made the name so authoritative. In neither of these two ways is it to be found again throughout the whole Old Testament except in Jud.vi.10,Ezek.xx.5,7,19 where the mention of the Exodus, and the covenant with the people, bring it up once more (comp. also Ps.lxxxi.10,Hos.xiii.4). Similar phrases are also to be found in the latter portion of Isaiah,

and occasionally in Jeremiah, Zechariah and Malachi (in all 17 times), but always intimately connected with the context. The expression 'that ye may know that I am Jehovah' occurs moreover very frequently in Ezekiel (59 times). But the *authoritative* 'I am Jehovah' *nowhere* except in the Pentateuch and the two passages just referred to. Had the name Jehovah been the production of a later age, it would surely have been used in this way by other writers, besides the unknown authors of the Pentateuchal laws and narrative. Had these authors lived long after the introduction of the name, and the events with which it was connected, they would scarcely have thought of thus employing it; especially if they wrote (as is supposed), not for the purpose of honestly recording the history of past times, but solely for the benefit and instruction of their own contemporaries, to whom such a use of the familiar name Jehovah would have seemed strange and purposeless indeed. Viewed, however, in connection with its publication by Moses, as the herald of deliverance, and used to confirm laws made for those who had themselves heard that publication, and partaken of that deliverance, and who as a consequence had '*believed Jehovah* and his servant Moses' (Ex.xiv. 31), and all is natural and consistent enough. Nor must we overlook the fact, that it is ever the simple 'Jehovah' which is thus employed to give weight and authority to the divine commands, not the 'Jehovah Sabaoth' ('Lord of Hosts' E.V.) of later writers, which appears to have come into use about the time of Samuel, and was evidently regarded as the most emphatic and authoritative name at their command by nearly all the Prophetical writers, besides occurring occasionally in the historical books, and more frequently in the Psalms, but which is not once to be found in the Pentateuch, or books of Joshua and Judges.* Further

* It occurs 57 times in Isaiah (49 in the former portion, 3 in the history, and 5 in the later), 76 times in Jeremiah, 9 times in Amos, twice in Nahum, once (each) in Hosea, Micah, Habukkuk, and Zephaniah, 13 times in

incidental signs of the newness of the name Jehovah, and its connection with the deliverance from Egypt, might easily be advanced. But enough as been said to establish the point before us, to shew the agreement between the record of Ex.iii. and vi. and the general narrative of the Exodus, and the probability of the latter having been written shortly after the name Jehovah was thus introduced, with the difficulties which beset the contrary view.

We pass on now to consider those more Elohistic portions of the central books, already pointed out (p.13), which are regarded by many as evidences of compilation here also; and whose characteristics must therefore be discussed, before we can form a conclusive judgment on the questions of Authorship. We shall consider them in order.

1. Ex.i.-ii. seem clearly to be from another hand to the main story of the Exodus. They contain Elohim 8 times, Jehovah not once; and are further distinguished by the use of 'Raguel' as the name of Moses' father-in-law (ii.18), instead of the more usual 'Jethro' (comp. however Nu.x.29). Now, as the close of the book of Genesis is also Elohistic, it might seem at first as if these opening chapters of Exodus were merely a continuation of the same narrative, by the same writer. Against this, however, must be urged the introductory note concerning the number of Jacob's descendants who came into Egypt, in i.1-5, who had been already enumerated and summed up in Gen.xlvi.8-27. As also the statement concerning Joseph's death in i.6, fully detailed in the concluding verses of the last chapter of Genesis (l.24-6). Such repetitions in a continuous narrative would be strange and unaccountable in the extreme. Regard these two chapters of

---

Haggai, 50 times in Zechariah, and 23 times in Malachi; 5 times (each) in 1 and 2 Samuel, 3 times in 1 Kings, once in 2 Kings, 3 times in 1 Chronicles, 15 times in the Psalms (11 in those of the time of David). It is not found in Ezekiel, Lamentations, Daniel, Obadiah, Jonah, or Joel; Ruth, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes or Solomon's Song.

Exodus, however, as an independent history, and the propriety of such introductory notes is at once apparent; since how could an account of the sufferings and deliverance of the Israelites be more naturally prefaced, than by a brief epitomy of their previous history in connection with Egypt, like that contained in *v.*1-7?

2. Ex.iii. is regarded by Bishop Colenso as written by the same hand as the Elohistic sections of Genesis, but retouched here and there by a later writer. Taken in its connection with the following chapters it certainly looks more like the commencement of the main (Jehovistic) narrative of the Exodus. At all events its use of Jethro instead of Raguel (iii.1), and the predominance of Jehovah throughout instead of Elohim, mark its distinctness from chap.i.-ii. very clearly. It will be well, therefore, to consider Bishop Colenso's reasons for ascribing it to the Elohist, in detail. They are as follows:—

(i.) "The name 'Elohim' occurs in it repeatedly, in fact, *twenty-one* times."

Ans. In *twelve* out of these 'twenty-one times' Elohim is absolutely necessary, and could not have been replaced by Jehovah, whoever had written the chapter. Jehovah occurs in it *seven* times; so that the two names in reality are very nearly on an equality. Nay, if the remainder of the story up to iv.18 be taken into account, as it surely ought to be,* Jehovah is by far the commoner, occurring altogether 16 times to Elohim 10 times. Nor can this be explained on account of the supposed revelation of the name Jehovah in this chapter (see p.117-9), since it is found *three* times before *v.*14, where this is said to have taken place, albeit Bishop Colenso asserts that the word is used by the Elohist '*for the first time* in *v.*15.' The other cases would doubtless be ascribed by him to the 'retouching' of a later hand! It may be observed also, that in most cases where any such vision or appearance of God is described in the book of Exodus, Elohim is used more com-

* As iv.18 contains the name 'Jethro' twice, which is by Bishop Colenso regarded as a sure sign of Elohistic composition, there certainly can be no reason for arbitrarily excluding the latter part of the interview, and drawing conclusions from the former only. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that there is no division in the original Hebrew between the two chapters, not even the ordinary ס or פ to mark transition of paragraphs.

monly than in the general narrative, as if there were something about this more general name for deity, which was felt to be peculiarly appropriate to such descriptions (see xix.3,17,19,xx.1,19,20,21,xxiv.11, also Deut.iv.33,v.24, comp. however, Ex.xxxiv). A circumstance which may perhaps account for its occurrence here.

(ii.) "The phrase 'Mount of Elohim' in *v.*1, is found again in Ex.xviii.5, xxiv.13, which are decidedly Elohistic passages, and in the first of them, *Jethro* is given, as here, for the name of Moses's father-in-law, not Reuel, or Raguel, Heb. רְעוּאֵל, as in Ex.ii.18,Nu.x.29. For 'mount of Elohim' the later writer uses 'mount of Jehovah' Nu.x.33."

Ans. To suppose Ex.ii., which does not once contain Jehovah, to be Jehovistic, in order to make iii. which contains it 7 times, Elohistic, is certainly a remarkable piece of assumption. Yet is it necessary to make the above argument concerning Raguel and Jethro tenable. 'Jethro' occurs 10 times in the Pentateuch, viz. 3 times here in Ex.iii.-iv., and 7 times in xviii., both of them sections where Elohim and Jehovah occur in nearly equal proportion. Raguel occurs twice, once in a decidedly Elohistic, and once in a decidedly Jehovistic section. To speak of the former as an Elohistic name and the latter as a Jehovistic, is therefore to ignore the facts of the case altogether, and set up theory in their place. That the usage of the two names may be a tolerably safe indication of different authorship, at all events in consecutive passages, we would readily admit; but that it furnishes any sign of *date*, we cannot see that there is the slightest warrant for assuming.

With respect to the other phrase insisted on, 'mount of Elohim', we may observe, that it occurs in all 4 times in the Pentateuch, Ex.iii.1,iv.27,xviii.5, xxiv.13; the other phrase 'mount of Jehovah' but once, Nu.x.33. It is asserted by Bishop Colenso, that three out of these four are 'decidedly Elohistic passages,' viz. the one directly in question, iii.1, and xviii.5, xxiv.13. Chap.xviii., as already remarked, is of a *mixed* character, containing Elohim 11 times, Jehovah 6. Chap.xxiv. is certainly a curious specimen of Elohistic composition, containing Elohim thrice (once necessary), Jehovah 10 times. Both chapters have doubtless been 'retouched here and there', by a later writer. The other passage (iv.27), not alluded to by Bishop Colenso, is also decidedly Jehovistic; quite as much so as Nu.x.33, where 'mount of Jehovah' is employed. It is hence plainly unreasonable to urge the use of this phrase as a sign of date, since it is used as frequently in Jehovistic as in Elohistic sections. It was in all probability a name for Horeb long before the Exodus,* and was thus naturally adopted by the Jewish historians quite independently of their own preference for Jehovah and Elohim.

(iii.) "The expression in *v.*6 'I am the Elohim of thy father, the Elohim of Abraham, the Elohim of Isaac, and the Elohim of Jacob' is thoroughly

* See Stanley's Sinai and Palestine p.48-9 for a statement of the reasons which render it likely that Horeb was accounted a holy place by the inhabitants of the wilderness, before the giving of the law.

Elohistic. The Jehovist would most probably have written, 'I am Jehovah, the Elohim of thy father &c.' "

'*Ans.* It is remarkable, that this very expression, 'Jehovah, the Elohim of your fathers &c.,' which Bishop Colenso says 'the Jehovist would most probably have written,' occurs in Ex.iii.-iv,18 no fewer than *three* times, (iii.15, 16,iv.5). We prefer then to believe, that the Jehovist did write them, and merely omitted the Jehovah in *v.*6, because God had not as yet authoritatively published that name; he himself had twice employed it before *v.*6. Nor must it be forgotten, that sometimes in the most Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch Elohim will occur in place of Jehovah, without any reason being apparent, and where it would be absurd to suppose it to have originated from an Elohistic writer.*

All things considered, therefore, there seems to be no sufficient reason for refusing to Ex.iii. that position which its contents and style naturally claim for it, as the opening of the main (Jehovistic) record of the Exodus.

3. Ex.vi.2-12 is another section which Bishop Colenso would ascribe to the pen of the Elohist, on account of its containing the statement as to the newness of the name Jehovah already considered (p. 116-7). And no doubt, were his theory of the origin of the Pentateuch correct, this would be the most reasonable view of it. Regarding the Pentateuch, however, as contemporaneous history, and its statements respecting the introduction of the name, Jehovah, as real facts, the passage is manifestly of later date than the Elohistic sections of Genesis, and considering its well marked Jehovistic character (it contains Jehovah 7 times, Elohim once, and El Shaddai once) is most naturally regarded as part of the same main Jehovistic narrative commenced in Ex.iii. It follows naturally on the preceding section and is closely connected with the whole story. Bishop Colenso, however, would fain

---

* *E.g.*,Nu.xii.13 where Moses prays for Miriam, 'Heal her now, O Elohim, I beseech thee' (the chapter contains Jehovah 9 times, Elohim but this once); Nu.xvi.22 where Moses and Aaron intercede for the congregation in the matter of Korah 'O Elohim, the Elohim of the spirits of all flesh,' (the chapter contains Jehovah 18 times, Elohim but this once) while in Nu.xxvii. 16 we have the very same phrase, only with Jehovah instead of Elohim. (See also Nu.xxi.5).

represent its Elohistic origin as established on independent internal evidence. He writes as follows (Pt.ii.p.260):—

"It is *certain* that Ex.vi.1-13 is due to the Elohist; for, besides other indications (as will be seen more fully hereafter), it contains the expression 'El Shaddai' in *v.*3, which occurs six times in the Pentateuch, always in Elohistic passages, and in no other place in the Bible, except Ezek.x.5 'as the voice of El Shaddai, when he speaketh.'"

Ans. But surely this fact of its occurring in Ezekiel is in itself fatal to the whole reasoning. If the phrase be so certainly and exclusively Elohistic, as to make its occurrence a sufficient ground for assigning a passage with *certainty* to a particular author, then surely Ezek.x.5 must also be due to the same hand. But if it be admitted that a Jehovistic writer (as Ezekiel certainly was) *might* occasionally use the phrase; then it is clear that the argument founded upon its occurrence here is inconclusive. Still more strikingly does this appear, when we remember that this same word 'Shaddai' (only without 'El') occurs besides, twice in Nu.xxiv., twice in Ruth, twice in the Psalms, once (each) in Isaiah, Ezekiel and Joel, besides 31 times in Job, (vide Bishop Colenso, p. 260 note). But putting this on one side, how could its use in the passage before us have possibly been avoided? It occurs, it will be observed, not in the mouth of Moses or the Israelites, but in the mouth of God; with reference, not to the present, but the *past*. In enforcing and emphasizing his new name, Jehovah, God looks back to former times, and desires to contrast it with the name by which he had appeared to the Patriarchs. That name was 'El Shaddai.' How then could he achieve his purpose without mentioning it? Let the writer be as Jehovistic as possible,—be he Nathan, or Gad, or Jeremiah,—how could he record these words, or express the idea which they contain, without employing this name? It is manifest that its occurrence here depended, not upon the preference or custom of the writer, but upon the subject-matter with which he had to deal. As a sign of date or authorship, therefore, it is simply worthless. It would be as reasonable to ascribe the above quotation from Bishop Colenso's own book to the Elohist, on account of its *twice* containing 'El Shaddai,' as to attempt to fix the authorship of Ex.vi. on such a ground.*

4. Ex.xiii.17-9 is a curious Elohistic fragment in the midst of the most decidedly Jehovistic narrative. It contains Elohim 4 times, Jehovah not once. As far as matter is concerned it might well be part of the general narrative, although its connec-

* The solitary Elohim at the opening of the passage (*v.*2), which might also, perhaps, be urged as an argument, arose doubtless from the desire to throw into stronger light the new name Jehovah, and at the same time establish the identity of the three names beyond a doubt.

tion is not so intimate, but that it might be removed without any gap being felt. We are thus left entirely to the evidence of phraseology. This is certainly remarkable, and we shall therefore prefer to regard the verses as a fragment of that same Elohistic narrative of the Exodus, of which the commencement has been preserved to us in Ex.i.-ii. (see p.127-8).*

5. Ex.xviii. has been already frequently alluded to as a passage of mixed character. It contains Elohim 12 times (once necessary), Jehovah 6 times, and is clearly therefore far more Elohistic than the general narrative of the Exodus, while yet distinguished from that other narrative, to which Ex.i.-ii. and xiii.17-9 belong, both by its use of Jehovah at all, and still more clearly by its employment of the name Jethro instead of Raguel. If distinct from the main narrative, it must be regarded therefore as a passage *sui generis*, and of independent origin from all the rest. That it is so, is rendered very probable from the fact, that as it now stands it is out of chronological order. This appears in many ways. (1.) It is said in *v.*5, that Jethro came to Moses 'where he encamped at the *mountain of God.*' Now the last station mentioned in the previous chapter is Rephidim, where the battle was fought with Amalek (xvii.1,8). While in xix.1-2 we read 'On the third month, after the children of Israel were gone out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they to the desert of Sinai. For *they journeyed from Rephidim*, and came to the desert of Sinai, and encamped in the desert; and there Israel

* Bishop Colenso also urges the mention of the bringing up of Joseph's bones (*v.*19), as a further argument for the Elohistic origin of this fragment, in as much as the command to do so is recorded in the Elohistic section at the close of Genesis (l.25). For the same reason he assigns Josh.xxiv.32, which contains the account of their burial, to the same author. But how the mention of a series of facts, relating to one particular subject (which occurred at intervals of some 140 and 50 years from each other) can prove identity of Authorship, it is certainly hard to see. Whoever the authors of this fragment, or of Joshua xxiv., may have been, they both most certainly had the words of Gen.l.25 before them, and would naturally refer to and quote them, whether they were written by themselves or not. In fact would be more likely to do so, if they were not.

encamped *before the mountain.*' Chap.xviii. clearly, then, relates to events which happened *after* the journey recorded in xix.1-2. (2.) Moses speaks in this chapter (*v.*16) of making the people 'know the statutes of God and his laws' (see also *v.*20), which he plainly could not do until those laws had first been given to him, which was not until after they had been at Sinai some days. The laws referred to are doubtless those recorded in Ex.xxi.-iii. as 'the judgments' which Moses was to 'put before them.' Nay more, the time when Moses was engaged in teaching these laws to the people, and settling their disputes, must have been *after* the double period of forty days, which he spent in the mount, and therefore either during the building of the tabernacle or still later. Jethro's offering a sacrifice (*v.*12) may perhaps shew that his visit was before the consecration of Aaron and his sons to the Priest's office; if so before the first month of the second year. At all events it must have been towards the end of their sojourn at Sinai. (3.) At the end of this narrative about Jethro we read 'And Moses let his father-in-law go, and he went his way into his own land' (*v.*27). In Nu.x.29-32 we find, that just before they started from Sinai, 'Hobab, the son of Raguel the Midianite Moses' father-in-law' was anxious to depart to his own land, but was entreated by Moses to abide with them, which we gather from a later narrative he did (Jud.i.16,iv.11). These two events, the departure of Jethro and the intended departure of his son Hobab, may be most naturally regarded as occurring at the same time. (4.) It is expressly stated by Moses in Deut.i.9-18 that the appointment of officers and judges, recorded in Ex.xviii.21-6, took place just before their departure from Horeb (Deut.i.6-7,19). The narrative of Jethro's visit is thus clearly quite out of place, so as, we may be sure, it would never have been, had it been written by the same hand as the rest of the story. It must have come from some independent source, and been inserted in its present position *after* the completion of the main narrative, there being no other place where it would so little disturb the connection. With respect to authorship we can only

conjecture, but as it was manifestly written by some one not so familiar with the name Jehovah as with Elohim (the former is never used except in immediate connection with the deliverance of Israel from Egypt), we may suggest Hobab himself as perhaps as likely a person as any.

6. Nu.xxii.-iv. is clearly an episodic narrative, very distinct from the general history. It contains Jehovah 28 times, Elohim 15, Shaddai twice. It is plain from the allusions of Moses in Deut.xxiii.4-5, that the mission of Balaam, and the overruling of his curse into a blessing, were facts well known among the people. But how should they have attained to such an accurate acquaintance with his prophecy? The large use of Elohim, with the ancient Shaddai, and the uncommon Elyon (Most High)* all seem to point to other authorship. Why may it not then have been written by Balaam himself, or some one intimate with him? It is eminently unlikely that so wonderful a history and prophecy as his should have passed unrecorded among the nations whom he visited, and who regarded all his sayings as certainly true (Nu. xxii.6). The general tone of the narrative too, which everywhere represents the conduct of Balaam in the most favourable light possible, agrees well with such an idea. While the war upon Midian which occurred shortly afterwards, and in which Balaam was killed (Nu.xxxi.8), would easily account for a document of this kind falling into the hands of the Israelites, and being incorporated into their history, either by the author of the original narrative, or a later compiler. This is of course mere conjecture, but it seems the most plausible view which presents itself, and, without involving any difficulties, accounts readily for all the phenomena before us.†

---

* This Divine title is found 4 times in the non-jewish Gen.xiv. (see p. 95), once also in the Song of Moses (Deut.xxxii.8), but nowhere else in the Pentateuch.

† Bishop Colenso has indeed objected, that it is unnatural for Balaam to use Jehovah *at all*, more especially to speak of him as 'his God' (xxii.18).

These are all the Elohistic passages which the later books of the Pentateuch can fairly be said to contain. The others alleged are mere isolated verses or expressions, which are required to be excepted to conform to particular theories, but which have no internal evidence of origin to render them worth consideration here. We have next to discuss four other sections of the book of Exodus, which though equally Jehovistic with the rest of the narrative, appear, from other marks of internal evidence, to be foreign to it.

1. Ex.iv.19, 'And Jehovah said unto Moses in Midian, Go, return into Egypt; for all the men are dead who sought thy life.' This, after the full account already given of Moses' mission and its purpose, is certainly strange; pre-eminently so, when we remember that the immediately preceding verse records his *request* to Jethro to return, and the permission granted to him to do so. The precise mention of the place 'in Midian' gives the passage the appearance of being part of some other narrative, inserted here verbatim, on account of the fact contained in it having been passed over in the main story.

2. Ex.vi.13-30, the genealogy of Moses and Aaron. The last verse of the preceding section (vi.2-12) closes with a question of Moses. 'And Moses spake before Jehovah, saying, Behold, the children of Israel have not hearkened unto me; how then shall Pharaoh hear me, who am of uncircumcised lips?'* It might

---

It is clear, however, that Balaam, whatever his personal character may have been, was a worshipper of the true God, and an inspired prophet. He had doubtless heard of the wonders of the Exodus, and the new name of God connected with it, and knowing this God of the Hebrews to be the same with his, it was no more than natural that he should adopt it, and thus increase his reputation among the astonished people of the east. A similar objection has been made to the use of the name by Rahab the harlot (Josh.ii.10-2). The notoriety of the name, from its connection with the Exodus, is again the explanation.

* In allusion doubtless to his slowness of speech, Ex.iv.10 (comp.iv.14-6 with vii.1-2).

have seemed at first sight as if the following verse, 'And Jehovah spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, and commanded them concerning the children of Israel, and concerning Pharaoh king of Egypt, to bring the children of Israel out of Egypt' was intended as a sort of general summary of the answer vouchsafed to him. But no, the very same question is found again in *v.*30, with the answer recorded in full in the following verses (vii.1-5). No writer would thus have interrupted his own narrative to insert a genealogy, or have needlessly repeated himself in this way. The passage is clearly a later addition, to supply information which the original writer had omitted to give. The genealogy itself is curious; a quotation at first from Gen.xlvi., Reuben and Simeon's children are carefully enumerated (though having nothing to do with the subject), the list being broken off at Levi, whose descendants are then given, down to Aaron's grandson Phinehas. After this follow those most unmosaic verses already quoted (p.4), beginning, 'These are that Aaron and Moses to whom Jehovah said, Bring out the children of Israel, &c.' This closes the genealogy, and the original narrative is linked on again by the transitional verses, 'And it came to pass on the day Jehovah spake unto Moses in the land of Egypt, that Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, I am Jehovah; speak thou unto Pharaoh king of Egypt all that I impart unto thee. And Moses said before Jehovah, Behold, I am of uncircumcised lips, and how shall Pharaoh hearken unto me?' (*v.*28-30). A clearer instance of interpolation cannot well be imagined.

3. Ex.xi.1-3 contains a message of Jehovah to Moses concerning the last plague and the Exodus, inserted in the middle of Moses' reply to Pharaoh (x.29,xi.4-8). This circumstance alone, however, would scarcely be sufficient to warrant us in regarding the verses as a later interpolation, since it is quite possible that such a message might have been conveyed to Moses' mind while standing before Pharaoh. But then besides this there is the direction about borrowing (*v.*2), and the statement of its success

(*v.*3), 'And Jehovah gave the people favour in the eyes of Egypt. Moreover the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the eyes of Pharaoh's servants, and in the eyes of the people'. It is most unlikely that the author of the main narrative would have inserted these last two verses in their present position, or indeed have made such an explanatory statement respecting Moses at all. The whole passage may, therefore, be best regarded as a later addition; though the alternative is certainly quite admissible of supposing *v.*1 or even *v.*1-2 as original, and only the latter part of later date.

4. Ex.xii.43-51 is occupied with regulations respecting the Passover, and therefore quite out of chronological position, the first stage of the Exodus itself being recorded in the preceding 14 verses. This might be thought, perhaps, to be sufficiently accounted for by the closing words of the previous section, 'This is that night of observation unto Jehovah for all the children of Israel throughout their generations' (*v.*42), which would make any further information respecting the keeping of the Passover not unnatural. In addition to this, however, we have the repetition in *v.*51 of the statement already made in *v.*41, 'And it came to pass the self-same day Jehovah brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt by their hosts'; as if to bring back the narrative to the same place where it had been broken off (comp. Ex.vi.12, and 30 commented on above). On the whole, therefore, it seems best to ascribe these verses also to a later hand that the original narrator.

Additions by a later hand being thus proved to exist in the story of the Exodus, it is by no means improbable that some of the other minor incongruities and explanatory notes, which occur here and there, may be due to the same source. Such for example as Ex.vii.7, 'And Moses was eighty years old, and Aaron eighty-three years old, when they spake unto Pharaoh'; Nu.xii.3 'And the man Moses was very meek, above all the men who were upon the face of the earth'; Nu.xxvi.9-11 'This is that

Dathan and Abiram, the called ones of the congregation, who excited strife against Moses and against Aaron in the congregation of Korah &c.'; perhaps also Nu.xxvi.58-61, concerning the parentage and descendants of Aaron. Once more we cannot help noticing the agreement between the results now arrived at, and those which were deduced from a consideration of the anachronisms (real or supposed) which the narrative presents. A revision of the Jehovistic sections by a still later hand was found then to be implied by several passages, on account of their *subject-matter*. The same has now been evidenced by a consideration of the *connection* and *phraseology* of other and very different passages. Each line of argument of course supports and strengthens the other; 'a three-fold cord is not quickly broken.'

We have now arrived nearly at the close of this part of our investigations, and the time is well nigh come to draw all our results together into one, and express in brief the view of the origin of the Pentateuch to which our inquiries have conducted us. Much has been written on the subject before, and much will doubtless be written on it hereafter. Many and many have been the theories advanced, differing most widely from each other, yet each professing to solve the difficulties, and explain the often conflicting phenomena presented by these books, more perfectly and satisfactorily than its predecessor. And this diversity has often been urged as a sufficient answer to any arguments against the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch in any way connected with these theories. Once give up the traditionary belief in an undivided Mosaic authorship, it is said, and you are launched out into an ocean of doubt and controversy, where you may wander about, tossed hither and thither by every fresh wave of theory, till faith is shipwrecked; but where the haven of Truth is sought in vain. It must be confessed, that if any should set out on these inquiries guided merely by the theories of modern (rationalist) critics, such a result might not improbably find place. Though based upon a foundation of fact, these theories have for

the most part so much of fancy and assumption about them, that they mislead and distort almost as much as they assist and enlighten. It has happened with Biblical Critics as with most theorizers, that they have set up their theory first and then gone to the facts to seek for proofs, instead of beginning with the facts and deducing from them their theory. To propound a new and original theory, and enforce it by a long array of arguments is a far easier and also a far more attractive task, than patiently to study all the facts concerned, and suffer yourself to be guided solely by them in forming your judgment. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, that it has been the course oftenest pursued; while that it should yield the most discordant results is no more than might reasonably have been expected. The proper conclusion to be drawn from such a state of things is—not that the tendency of all such theories is wrong, the facts on which they rest unreliable, but rather—that the *method* on which they have been framed is faulty. They have owed more to their authors than their subject, and therefore they have failed in their purpose. Not that they are consequently worthless or contemptible; each one has probably brought some fact or peculiarity into prominence, which might otherwise have been passed by unnoticed. The history of Science will shew, that conflicting theories have ever been among the most useful helps to progress. So is it with the Science of Biblical Criticism. The Pentateuch would never have been so studied, or its characteristics so carefully examined, had it not been for this diversity of theories as to its origin. And we may fairly hope, that, as the result of all the doubt and controversy which now rages around it, the Truth concerning it will become more firmly established and more undoubtingly believed than ever. Yet let not the divergences of these various theories be overrated. All start with the same fundamental premiss—the Pentateuch is a *compilation;* all are agreed as to the *bulk* of the passages which must be separated from the main structure. Here the difference begins; for besides these manifestly diverse portions, there are

other doubtful ones, on which naturally critics differ. Then, too, there are minute differences between the individual passages of each group thus eliminated, which some will think call for still further subdivision, while others will regard them as no more than might probably arise from the variations of a single writer. And thus it happens that with respect to a few passages, where internal evidence is meagre or vague, great diversity of opinion may be shewn to exist among the leading critics; that one will speak of two or three authors, another of six or seven, a third of ten or twelve; when yet all the while on the main facts of the case, which form the foundation of their theories, they are completely agreed. When, however, we pass from these matters of detailed criticism, to more general points of judgment and opinion, the most startling discrepancies in results at once appear. Whatever agreement there may be among Biblical Critics as to the sections of which the Pentateuch is composed, and their classification, there is little or none when the question of date and authorship comes into view. Nearly every epoch of Jewish history, from the Exodus to the Captivity, has been fixed upon by one critic or another as the probable period when the main narrative of the Exodus was composed, with of course corresponding divergences as to the other subsidiary sections. This diversity of opinion it is, which is constantly alluded to by controversialists as a fatal objection to the whole argument, though often represented by them as a diversity respecting the *constitution* of the Pentateuch, not, as it really is, a diversity respecting date and authorship merely.* This diversity it is, which is mainly due to the desire to theorize rather than deduce. The admission that the Pentateuch is a compilation, throws open the question of

* A somewhat parallel case is seen in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Critics being all but unanimous in denying its Pauline authorship, though differing considerably as to who *did* write it. The two points are clearly very different, and discordance in respect to the latter does not in any way affect the value of unanimity in regard to the former.

authorship at once, by destroying the only *a priori* reason for ascribing it to Moses—the testimony of tradition. The date of every portion has to be severally determined, from internal evidence only. The result arrived at will, therefore, necessarily depend very much upon the value which each critic may set upon the different kinds of such evidence at his disposal. One starts with the assumption that the narrative is legendary, but the laws authentic, another that both are unreliable, a third that both are authentic. It is manifest that with such diverse prepossessions the most diverse conclusions must result. He who disbelieves the history, or laws, or both, ignores at once all the direct evidence which these respectively present, and confines himself to the more indirect, such as phraseology or style. Each again has his own views of Jewish history, and the state of religion during its successive epochs, and so his own standards of comparison, by which the various sections of the Pentateuch are to be tried and classified. It is not to be wondered at that scarcely two are agreed.*

A prejudiced and one sided view of the question being thus, as it appears, the chief source of this diversity in the results of modern criticism, we have endeavoured, in the inquiry now just completed, so far as possible to avoid it. We entered the discussion unbiased by any theory, but prepared to adopt whatever conclusion the facts of the case, fairly considered, might seem to require. Impressed with the conviction that the narrative was true, the laws authentic, and both probably contemporary or nearly so with the events (the result of previous investigations),

---

* In the midst of this diversity it must not be overlooked, that those critics who believe most firmly and implicitly in the truthfulness and reliability of the Pentateuch, always assign it to the *earliest date*. The two things, as already remarked, have no necessary *a priori* connection with each other, since though a contemporaneous history could hardly be false, a true one might easily be late. The fact is hence a strong proof, that the internal evidence of the Pentateuch, if fairly and impartially considered, *is* in favour of its early origin, despite of all that has been said to the contrary.

we have yet striven to keep the question of Mosaic authorship out of sight, until the more important ones of constitution and date had been fully discussed, lest prejudice rather than reason should become our guide. And it must be confessed, that the results we have thus arrived at do differ very materially from the views commonly held. The pre-mosaic origin of large portions of Genesis; the existence of two records of the Exodus, one certainly therefore non-mosaic; the incorporation of narratives of foreign origin; the numerous additions and occasional alterations made by a later writer after the conquest; these are facts very strongly at variance with the notions generally entertained. Facts they are however, not mere theoretic fancies, or unfounded assumptions; and in accordance with them must we frame our final view of the true origin of the Pentateuch.

Much of it is certainly unmosaic; some earlier, some contemporary, some later than Moses,—many portions of the Pentateuch *could not* have proceeded from his pen, or even have been written under his direction. But what of the remainder? what of the Jehovistic supplement to Genesis, the main narrative of the Exodus and sojourn in the wilderness, the laws? is there any good reason for believing *them* to be the work of Moses? This yet remains to be discussed.

We have already pointed out, that if the laws recorded in the three central books were really given to Moses by God, and proclaimed by him to the people (as there is every reason to believe they were), then there is a very strong presumption in favour of his having recorded them also in writing, in the form in which we now find them; especially as there is no appearance of *their* having undergone any revision. Here then is an excellent test for the Mosaic authorship of the narrative amongst which they are dispersed. If the same hand wrote both, then we may reasonably expect to find the whole history from Ex.iii. to Nu. xxxvi. (omitting of course the later additions, and foreign narratives) consecutive and harmonious, each section of law and narrative

in its proper order, without break or flaw anywhere. If on the contrary the laws and narrative were by different hands (and as a consequence the latter non-mosaic), then it would very probably happen, that the two would not always flow on so smoothly and regularly, or adhere so closely to one another as on the first supposition. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the case remains the same, whether these laws and narrative were written by Moses personally, or merely under his superintendence. We shall now proceed to apply this test to the three books before us, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers.

From Ex.iii. to xi. (omitting iv.19, vi.13-30, and xi.1-3) is clear uninterrupted narrative, all apparently by the same hand. Then in xii.1-28 we have the instructions concerning the Passover, slightly out of order, certainly, as the final message to Pharaoh was probably delivered on the 14th day (Ex.xi.4),* while the directions recorded in xii.1-20, and 21-8 belong respectively to the beginning of the month, and the 10th day.† They could scarcely, however, have been inserted sooner, without marring the effect of the previous narrative. The opening phrase of the first, 'And Jehovah spake unto Moses and Aaron *in the land of Egypt*, saying &c.' (xii.1), may perhaps be a sign of altered authorship, but as there is nothing else in the passage which points to interpolation, and it is most improbable that the original narrator should have omitted all mention of the Passover (as according to this supposition he would have done), it will be safest to regard it as an integral part of his story, and the expression just quoted as merely intended to contrast the instructions here recorded, with those later ones given after the departure from Rameses (xiii.3-10). After this the narrative proceeds a step (xii.29-42), and then the

* If so, the three days of darkness (x.22-3) would be synchronous with the days during which the lamb was to be kept, days doubtless of preparation for flight. A very probable supposition.

† See Hist. Charact. Pent. p.71-2.

further instructions just alluded to, about the celebration of the Passover in Canaan, and the dedication of the first-born (xiii.3-16), occur very naturally, as delivered during the first halt of the Israelites at Succoth. From here the narrative goes on uninterruptedly (and in one part avowedly Mosaic*) to chap.xx., the giving of the law. The intimate connection of this with the story of their sojourn in the wilderness would of course prevent *its* being passed over by the historian. Not only, however, have we the ten commandments recorded, but also the long series of miscellaneous statutes of xx.19-xxiii. inseparably bound up with the narrative (comp. xx.18-21,xxiv.3), and expressly stated to have been written by Moses in a book before the next morning (xxiv.4,7). Again the narrative is resumed, until Moses ascends the mount to receive the instructions concerning the tabernacle (xxiv.18). These are then recorded at length in xxv. to xxxi. up to the point when Moses was just ready to come down (xxxi.18). Here the narrative of the golden calf is introduced (xxxii.1-6); and the words of Jehovah to Moses concerning it, with his intercession for the people (*v.*7-14), complete the record of his first forty days' sojourn in the mount. The narrative then continues on in exact order up to the second forty days, with the additional laws then delivered (xxxii.15-xxxiv.28), which also Moses was commanded to record in writing (xxxiv.27). After this comes the descent from the mount (xxxiv.29-35), and the publication of the instructions he had received to the people (xxxv.1-3, comp. xxxi. 13-7; xxxv.4-19, comp. xxv.1-8; xxxv.30-5, comp. xxxi.1-11). The account of the building and erection of the Tabernacle in accordance with these directions, and the further instructions recorded in xl.1-15, occupy the rest of the book (xxxv.20-xl.35). A more orderly and consecutive account could not possibly have been written. Law and narrative are inextricably intertwined and it were impossible to separate them; both must have been recorded

* Ex.xvii.8-16 the history of the war with Amalek, see p.3.

by the same pen. The conclusion of this account of the Tabernacle is remarkable for the long look forward which it takes, quite unlike anything that is to be found in the preceding sections. The Tabernacle was erected on the first day of the first month (xl.2,17), the children of Israel did not leave Mount Sinai till the twentieth day of the second month (Nu.x.11); yet here, at the close of the account of its erection, we have the statement 'And when the cloud was taken up from over the dwelling, the children of Israel journeyed in all their journeys; but if the cloud was not taken up, then they journeyed not till the day that it was taken up. For the cloud of Jehovah was upon the dwelling by day, and fire was on it by night, in the eyes of all the children of Israel, throughout all their journeys' (xl.36-8). The same is repeated again (only in different words and more fully) in Nu.ix.15-23. Had the author of Exodus intended continuing his narrative, he would scarcely have made such a statement here. Had he been the same with the author of Numbers, he would hardly have repeated it there; again, too, in connection with the building of the Tabernacle. How far this reasoning is correct will appear from the comparison of the order and arrangement of Exodus with that of Leviticus and Numbers.

The book of Leviticus opens with a full and detailed account of the laws of sacrifice and the provision for the priests (i.-vii.). Throughout, it will be noticed, Aaron and his sons are everywhere spoken of as Priests, although their consecration is not recorded until chap.viii.-ix. None of the directions, however, contained in these first chapters were needed for the consecration, which had been already fully ordered and arranged, when Moses received the instructions concerning the Tabernacle and its furniture (Ex.xxix.). Moreover, it is expressly stated, that these laws were given 'In the day that he (Jehovah) anointed them' (vii.35,36), that is, the day whose events are narrated in the *following chapter*. Here then is our first clear instance of unnecessary misplacement of law and narrative. After the

account of the consecration, and the sin and death of Nadab and Abihu (viii.-x.), we have a long series of laws (xi.-xxiii.) of whose date we know nothing, excepting one, which is said to have been given after the death of Aaron's two sons (xvi.1). Then come the directions for the supply of oil and shewbread (xxiv.1-9), the account of the man who fought in the camp and cursed (*v.*10-23), and various laws and exhortations concerning the land of Canaan (xxv.-vii.). All that we know concerning the date of these is contained in the closing verses of the last two chapters, 'These are the commandments, which Jehovah commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai' (xxvi.46,xxvii.34). Somewhere between the first day of the first month and the 20th of the second, they were all doubtless delivered; how far they follow the actual order of delivery we have no means of knowing.

The book of Numbers opens with an account of the numbering of the people, commenced on the first day of the second month (Nu.i.1,18), the camp arrangements for which it was made, and the selection and numbering of the Levites (i.-iv.). Then follow some regulations about the camp, and other miscellaneous laws, (v.-vi.). After this we have an account of the offerings made by the twelve princes 'on the day that Moses finished raising the dwelling, and anointed it, and sanctified it, and all the vessels thereof, &c.' (vii.1). This would appear to have been *after* the numbering and appointment of the Levites, since part of the princes' offering was given to them for their service (vii.5-9). But if so, then the appointment of the Levites must surely have *preceded* the general census, since otherwise these offerings of the princes must be placed a full month after the erection of the Tabernacle, which the expression in *v.*1 will scarcely allow. The narrative in these earlier chapters clearly does not follow the true order of events. It may be noticed also that the Levites are mentioned as a distinct class in Lev.xxv.32-4, while yet their selection is not mentioned until Nu.i.49-53. After this account of the princes' offerings, the narrative proceeds to speak of the

setting up of the lamps in the Tabernacle, and the consecration of the Levites (viii.). Next comes the record of the Sinaitic passover, held on the 14th day of the first month (ix.1-14), that is, a *fortnight before* the numbering recorded in chap.i. Then, immediately afterwards, the account of the cloud and its signals already referred to (p.145), the making of the silver trumpets, and the orderly departure of the Israelites from Sinai (ix.15-x.). After this the narrative proceeds uninterruptedly up to the defeat of the people at Hormah (xi.-iv.). Then we have a chapter of laws for the land of Canaan (xv.), containing also the episode of the sabbath-breaker (see p. 106-7). Then the narrative of the rebellion of Korah, and its consequences (xvi.-xvii.); with a full statement of the respective duties and provision of the Priests and Levites (xviii.), following very naturally on that rebellion; further laws concerning purification (xix.); and then again uninterrupted narrative to the appointment of Joshua (xx.-i.,xxv.-vii.). After this come a series of laws concerning special sacrifices, and vows (xxviii.-xxx.); the account of the war with Midian (xxxi.), and the settlement of the two tribes and a half on the eastern side of Jordan (xxxii.). Then follow the list of journeyings (xxxiii.1-49), copied from the record of Moses (xxxiii.2, see p.3); Jehovah's directions as to the division and boundaries of the land of Canaan (xxxiii.50-xxxiv.), the cities of the Levites and the cities of refuge (xxxv.); and the final settlement of the case of Zelophehad's daughters, necessitated by these laws of inheritance (xxxvi.); the whole being summed up by the statement, 'These are the commandments and the judgments, which Jehovah commanded by the hand of Moses unto the children of Israel in the plains of Moab by the Jordan near Jericho' (xxxvi.13). So far as the latter part of the book of Numbers is concerned, then, the order of laws and narrative is regular and accurate enough, although the two are everywhere perfectly distinct and easily separable. In the former part, however, considerable confusion exists, and not only are laws and narrative irregularly disposed, but even different

sections of the latter transposed in the most unaccountable manner. The last seven weeks' sojourn at Sinai was no doubt a most eventful period, the laws then promulgated very numerous, and the arrangement hence somewhat difficult. But in the record preserved to us in Leviticus and Nu.i.-x. there is not even the attempt to narrate them in orderly succession. They have been cast together into groups, irrespective of date; a classified record, rather than a chronological. The arrangement thus adopted was no doubt easier, and in some respects more useful than the other, the collection of laws in Leviticus being especially advantageous. Nor does it any way affect the authenticity of the history. All that we wish to point out is the striking contrast between this part of the history, and that immediately preceding, recorded in the book of Exodus, as a proof that they must have proceeded from different authors, and that the latter is, so far as its narrative is concerned, most certainly unmosaic.

To adduce further arguments in support of this conclusion, may seem unnecessary after what has now been urged. We cannot, however, but recall the fact, that all the signs of post-mosaic authorship previously noted (such as the mention of Hebron in Nu.xiii.22, of Hormah in Nu.xiv.45, of the sabbath-breaker in the wilderness in Nu.xv.32-6, &c., see pp.106,110-2) refer to this *latter* part of the history, and not to the former. Another of those remarkable cases of agreement in result between diverse lines of argument, of which so many have already presented themselves. With respect to the book of Exodus, the argument for Mosaic authorship just adduced is certainly very strong, while the objections are weak in the extreme; merely the slight irregularity in the introduction of the directions for the Passover in Ex.xii., accounted for above (p.143), and the verse about the continuance of the manna (Ex.xvi.35), which was probably inserted by the same hand as the explanatory note about the 'omer' immediately following (see p.105). We may, therefore, fairly regard this point as established.

It now only remains to review the evidence concerning the Mosaic authorship of that portion of the Pentateuch as yet untouched,—the Jehovistic sections of Genesis. The reasons in favour of his authorship may be summed up as follows. 1. They were written by some one anxious to shew the identity of the new name Jehovah with the old Elohim, and desirous of extending the use of the former by every means in his power (p.121-7). 2. They were written by some one intimately acquainted with Egypt, its customs and its laws (see p.113 note, and comp. especially Gen. xxxix.4-5,xli.42,xlvii.13-26). 3. By some one not so familiar with the ancient names of Canaanitish places, as either the Elohist of Genesis, or the authors of Joshua and Judges; and living therefore probably before the conquest (see p.108-9). 4. They were written for people to whom the land of Egypt was familiarly known (see p.109-10). 5. Their author had at his disposal all the earlier records of his nation's history, and hesitated not to adopt, omit, enlarge, or alter these as he thought fit. These characteristics certainly find their easiest and most satisfactory explanation in the supposition that Moses was the author. Against his authorship, there is simply nothing to be urged. We may, therefore, fairly regard this also as established on very strong grounds of probability.

The materials of which the first four books are composed appear thus to be of very various dates and characters, the larger portion however being almost certainly Mosaic. They may be arranged as follows.

1. A series of 'Annals', embracing the chief features of primeval and patriarchal history down to the death of Joseph. Date and authorship unknown, but some probably written in Egypt, and all certainly pre-mosaic,* (Gen.i.-ii.4,v.1-28,30-2,vi.

* As already remarked there are some of the Elohistic sections which seem to reach back into a still greater antiquity, and especially the narrative of the Deluge with its niceties of dates (see p.29), and the account of the purchase of the cave of Machpelah (Gen.xxiii.), which has all the appearance of a contemporaneous record. Whether these were independent documents

9-22,vii.6-22,24,viii.1-19,ix.1-19,28-9,x.1-8,10-32,xi.10-32,xvii., xix.29,xx.1-17,xxi.2-xxii.10,20-4,xxiii.,xxv.1-20,xxviii.1-9,xxxi. 4-xxxvi.30,40-3,xxxvii.,xlii.5-xlvii.12,xlvii.27-l.)

2. Additional matter referring to the same periods, from the pen of Moses, variously inserted amongst these, to enlarge, supplement, or replace different portions of them, (Gen.ii.4-iv., v.29,vi.1-8,vii.1-5,vii.16 (part),23,viii.20-2,ix.20-7,xi.1-9,xii.-xiii. xv.-vi.,xvii.1 (part), xviii.-ix.28,30-38,xx.18-xxi.1,33 (part), xxii. 11-9,xxiv.,xxv.21-xxvii.,xxviii.10-22(slightly mixed), xxix.-xxxi. 3 (mixed), xxxviii.-xlii.4 (slightly mixed), xlvii.13-26).

3. An Elohistic narrative of the sojourn in Egypt, and the Exodus. Date and authorship unknown (Ex.i.-ii.,xiii.17-9).

4. A Jehovistic narrative of the Exodus, and passage through the wilderness, up to the erection of the Tabernacle, including the earlier portion of the Sinaitic laws; also a list of the journeyings in the wilderness, written by Moses (Ex.iii.-iv.18,20-vi.12,vii.-x., xi.4-xii.42,xiii.1-16,20-2,xiv.-vi.34,xvii.,xix.-xl.,Nu.xxxiii.3-49).

5. A series of laws delivered during the last 39 years of the journey through the wilderness, recorded probably by Moses (Lev.i.-vii.,xi.-xxiv.9,xxv.-vii.,Nu.v.5-vi.,xv.1-31,37-41,xviii.-ix., xxviii.-xxx.,xxxiii.50-xxxv.).

6. A narrative of the events of the 2nd and 40th years, with which these laws have been incorporated, written shortly after the conquest of Canaan. Author unknown (Lev.viii.-x.,xxiv.11-23 (in part), Nu.i.-v.4, vii.-xii.2, 4-16,xiii.-iv.,xv.32-6,xvi.-vii.,xix.- xxi.13, 16-35, xxii.1, xxv.-xxvi.9, 12-57, 62-5, xxvii., xxxi.-iii.2, xxxvi. (in part).

7. Three isolated narratives, concerning Abraham's war with the four kings, Jethro's visit to Moses, and Balaam's prophecies;

---

in the days of Moses, or had been incorporated by the Elohist annalist or annalists, must remain doubtful. The latter is, perhaps, the most probable view. The misplacement of Gen.xxxvii.1-2 (p.33 note), and the repetition in Gen.v.1-2 (p.28), would seem to shew that each set of 'annals' was a separate work.

probably (in part at least) of foreign origin (Gen.xiv.,Ex.xviii., Nu.xxii.2-iv.).

8. A variety of explanatory notes, additions, and occasional alterations, with a few passages of greater length chiefly from other ancient narratives, introduced by a writer of much later date; very probably in the days of Saul. (Gen.x.9,xii.6 (part), xiii.7 (part),Gen.xiv.2,3,7,8,14,17,22 (all in part), xxiii.2,19 (both in part), xxxi.49 (part), xxxvi.31-9,Ex.iv.19,vi.13-30,xi.1-3 (1-2 doubtful), xii.43-51,xvi.35-6,Nu.xii.3,xiii.22 (part), xxi.14-5,xxvi. 9-11,58-61).

Out of these diverse materials we believe the first four books of the Pentateuch to have been compiled. The proportion in which they are found may be roughly expressed as follows:—If these four books were divided into 1000 equal parts, then 1. (the pre-mosaic annals) would make up 164 of them; 2. 4. and 5. (the Mosaic portions) 576; 6. (the later narrative) 214; 7. (the foreign records) 26; 3. and 8. (the Elohistic Exodus, and the last revision) 10 each. About three-fourths of the whole matter contained in them may be ascribed therefore to Moses, or still earlier writers; and nearly the whole of the remainder to his contemporaries. There is only about one per cent. which can fairly be assigned to a later period. The books may justly then be termed the books of Moses, whether we regard their date, their author, or their subject; and the testimony of tradition to their origin be admitted as substantially correct. Yet let it be remembered, that it is not on this testimony that our conclusions have been based. We entered the discussion, indeed, with the presumption that the books were probably Mosaic, but we have never suffered that presumption to influence the course of our inquiries. We have endeavoured to solve the question by internal evidence only; by carefully observing the testimony afforded by the books themselves, both direct and indirect.* It is quite

* In the preface to his third Part, Bishop Colenso writes as follows: p.xix.-xx.—'The process of critical inquiry so far from eliciting *proofs* and *con-*

possible, that in so intricate a question, some of our deductions may have been faulty or over-strained, some portions of the books wrongly assigned. It would be extraordinary if it were not so. But at all events this has not resulted from prejudice. We started with no theory, we desired not to establish any, but simply to be guided by the books themselves, and to adopt that view of their origin which should seem to be implied by their own statements and characteristics, whether that view were old or new, agreeable to tradition or discordant with it. There is much in the question before us which we can never know, many problems which the internal testimony is insufficient to solve. It were easy to conjecture concerning these, to allot each group of passages to its several author,—to surmise which of Jacob's sons or grandsons may perchance have composed the 'annals' of his forefathers, whether Eleazar or Joshua resumed the narrative which Moses left unfinished; or who put the last correcting touches in the days of Saul. Whether the fragments of the Elohistic record of the Exodus, and the narratives of foreign origin, were inserted by the original narrators or the last compiler. Whether, in a word, the books assumed their present connected form, in the days of Joshua, or Samuel.—On all these

---

firmations of the Mosaic origin of these books, leads quite to the opposite conclusion. *All the arguments, drawn from an examination of the Pentateuch, point to one direction.* It is well to observe this. There is literally *nothing* in these books distinctly indicative of Mosaic authorship. The whole force of the argument for that authorship rests upon tradition, and may be referred back to the opinion of the Jews, who lived nearly a thousand years after the date assigned to Moses. It is not a question of *balanced internal evidence*, but a case where there is a *host* of indications, all tending to shew diversity of authorship and late date, and *none* discoverable, by all the ingenuity yet brought to bear upon the subject, which tend decidedly the other way; and the supporters of the traditional view will be found to be constantly occupied,—not in producing 'internal evidence' to shew that Moses *did* write the Pentateuch, but—in trying to account for the existence, on the assumption of his authorship, of so much internal evidence of the contrary.' How far these statements agree with the character of the arguments in the text, we leave the reader to judge.

topics it were easy to speculate, and so construct a plausible and well sounding theory. But we refrain; preferring rather to leave the conclusions at which we have arrived, in their native bareness and scanty proportions, as probable *facts*, than to weaken their strength by linking them to baseless fancies, or ingenious theories.

CHAPTER VII.

DEUTERONOMY,—PHRASEOLOGY AND STYLE.

(Bishop Colenso, Part III., Chap. I.—II., p. 391—414.)

The view adopted by Bishop Colenso in regard to the book of Deuteronomy has been already stated (p. 7). He regards it as essentially distinct from the rest of the Pentateuch, and of considerably later date; written indeed, most probably, in the reign of Josiah, and by the hand of the prophet Jeremiah. The evidence adduced in support of this view is of three kinds.

1. There is a very marked difference in language and style (it is said) between Deuteronomy and the other four books, a large number of ideas, phrases and words being found in the former which never occur in the latter, several also in the latter which are absent from the former. The language is manifestly later, and presents a marked resemblance to that of Jeremiah.
2. There are numerous discrepancies between the narratives and laws recorded in Deuteronomy and in the earlier books, which prove their diverse origin. The differences in the laws are just such as would be likely to arise from a considerable difference in date, and the altered circumstances of the times consequent thereon.
3. There are many anachronisms and other signs of time, which negative at once all idea of Mosaic origin. Several of these point clearly to the reign of Josiah or thereabouts, as the probable date of composition.

Before entering on the discussion of the first of these branches of evidence (the subject of the present chapter), it will be necessary

to premise a few words as to the *a priori* internal evidence of Mosaic origin. This in regard to Deuteronomy is very strong. The book consists almost entirely of Moses' own words, recorded with a circumstantiality of date and place (Deut.i.3-5,iv.44-6, xxvii.1,9,xxix.1,xxxi.1-2, &c.), which renders it plain, that whether genuine or not, the writer certainly *meant* them to be regarded in this light. If this book, then, were composed, as Bishop Colenso supposes, by a writer who lived some thousand years later than Moses, and who merely adopted this form of composition as the most likely to give weight and effect to the truths and precepts he desired to convey,—if this be so, then the book is nothing more or less than a *forgery*. Had it merely been the title of the book which made it appear to be Mosaic, we might perchance have taken refuge in the supposition, that it was intended all along as a work of fiction, to be received as such, improbable as such an hypothesis would be. But in that case the author would carefully have avoided all special details and historical minutiæ, which could only tend to mislead, and were moreover unnecessary to the achievement of his object. These details and minutiæ exist. If, then, the author of Deuteronomy knew that he was writing fiction, he must have inserted them for the express purpose of deceiving his readers, and giving his fancies a weight and authority they did not properly possess; and his work can only be regarded as a deliberate forgery. The presumption in favour of genuineness is thus the very strongest imaginable (see Introd. p. ix.), and nothing but the most overwhelming and irrefragible internal evidence can overthrow it. Arguments based upon differences of style and language certainly cannot; for the presumption in favour of Mosaic authorship is so much stronger in the case of Deuteronomy than in that of the other books, that should they appear to be of diverse origin, it would be far more reasonable to regard Deuteronomy as Mosaic, and the earlier books as non-mosaic, than the reverse. It is only therefore in its relation to our previous inquiries that the evidence of phraseology and style

is worth considering. It may lead us to ascribe the Jehovistic narratives of Genesis and Exodus, with the laws contained in the latter, and two following books, to another writer than Moses, but it cannot affect the question of the authorship of Deuteronomy in the least.

Although, however, we are thus bound to regard Deuteronomy as the standard of Mosaic composition, until internal evidence be alleged sufficient to prove it a forgery, we are certainly not warranted in supposing that the book in its present form is to be ascribed to Moses' pen. It contains the account of his death, which (as already remarked) we cannot, without the most extravagant and unjustifiable assumptions, regard as written by himself. Some part of the *narrative*, then, is clearly due to another hand, and as there is no appearance of this being a later addition, the same is probably the case with all the narrative sections (Deut.i.1-5,iv.41-9,xxix.1,xxxi. (in part), xxxii.44-52). The way in which the blessing of Moses is introduced in xxxiii.1, 'And this is the blessing wherewith Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death', and more especially *v.*4-5 'Moses commanded us a law, the possession of the congregation of Jacob. And he was king in Jeshurun, when the heads of the people, the tribes of Israel, were gathered together', are strongly confirmatory of this view, at least as respects this particular chapter. But it may be objected, perhaps, that in some places Moses is distinctly said to have put these addresses &c. into *writing*. This is certainly the case, both with respect to his last exposition of the law and exhortation to obedience (xxvii.-xxx.), and his prophetical song (xxxii.1-43); his writing and delivering them to the Priests the Levites being distinctly recorded (xxxi.9,19,22,24-6). This very circumstance, however, only furnishes another argument against his authorship of the entire book; since it is surely most improbable that Moses should have written these portions *twice over*; yet how else could he have given them into the hands of the Levites to keep, and at

the same time record his doing so, together with several later incidents, in the same breath? It seems therefore most reasonable, to regard the book of Deuteronomy as a collection of genuine addresses, laws &c. from the mouth, and most probably also the pen of Moses, compiled and arranged by some later writer. In comparing the phraseology of Deuteronomy with that of the other books, we must be careful, then, to confine ourselves to those portions of each, which there is reason to believe were written by Moses.

We shall now proceed to the detailed discussion of the evidence adduced by Bishop Colenso on this point, and the counter-evidence furnished by a further examination of the books concerned. The comparison to be made is twofold, Deuteronomy has to be shewn to be *diverse* from the earlier books, and *like* Jeremiah; and the theory requires that both these points should be established in each instance; since if Deuteronomy differs equally from the other books and from Jeremiah, it is clear that the argument cuts both ways, and is, for the purposes of Bishop Colenso's theory, worthless. We shall consider his lists of peculiarities and divergences seriatim.

1. We have certain preliminary instances, concerning the designation of the Priests, the national place of worship, the number of festivals to be observed &c., which as involving matters of fact and laws, will come under consideration further on (chap. viii.). There is only one which properly comes under the head of phraseology. It is as follows.

"The Deuteronomist uses תּוֹרָה 'Law', invariably of the *whole* law, whereas in the other books the word is used most frequently,—indeed almost always—of *particular* laws."

Ans. Our answer to this is three-fold.

(i) The word clearly *could* not be used in this comprehensive sense in speaking of particular enactments; its total absence from the first four books, which are mainly concerned with such special laws, would not therefore be in any way surprising; nor its frequent occurrence in Deuteronomy, which is mainly occupied with *general* exhortations, to be wondered at.

(ii) Out of the 22 instances of this comprehensive usage alleged, 3 are non-mosaic (Deut.i.5,iv.44,xxxiii.4); 14 refer merely to the 10 commandments, and the blessings and cursings connected with them recorded in xxvii.-viii. (xxvii.3,8,26,xxviii.58,61,xxix.21,29,xxx.10, xxxi.9,11,12,24,26,xxxii.46); two appear to refer to the *particular* law concerning kings, and not to the whole legislation (xvii.18,19, comp. *v.*16-7,20); and one to the ten commandments whose delivery Moses is reminding them of (iv.8). There thus remain but *two* where the phrase is used of the whole legislation (xvii.11,xxxiii.10).

(iii) It is admitted that there are *three* cases in the book of Exodus where the same is the case (xiii.9,xvi.4,xxiv.12), all Mosaic passages.

A more complete identity of usage cannot be conceived.

2. We have a list of twenty-two '*sentiments or statements, repeated again and again by the Deuteronomist, which occur, most of them very rarely, and many of them not at all, in any of the other books of the Pentateuch*'.

(1.) "That Israel should possess the land of nations 'greater and mightier than itself', iv.38,vii.1,ix.1,xi.23; comp.i.23,vii.17."

Ans. Not mentioned in any of the Mosaic sections of the other books, but alluded to in the report of the spies (Nu.xiii.28,31-3). Nowhere mentioned in Jeremiah.

(2.) "That Jehovah had 'led them forty years' through the wilderness, ii.7,viii.2,xxix.5."

Ans. Could not well be referred to until the forty years were over. Is alluded to in Nu.xxxii.13, which though non-mosaic, is a record of *Moses' words*. Unmentioned by Jeremiah.

(3.) "That there is only one God, iv.35,39,vi.4,xxxii.39; whereas in the other books this truth is not thus stated in plain terms, but rather the preeminent excellence of Jehovah, the God of Israel, above all other gods, is magnified."

Ans. Equally true of Jeremiah, where the superiority of Jehovah to other gods is often alluded to, but the fact of His being the only God never.

(4.) "That obedience will be blessed with long life, and the contrary, iv.1,40,v.16,33,vi.3,viii.1,xi.21,xvi.20,xxv.15,xxx.6,15-23,xxxii.47."

Ans. Three of these passages do not say anything about 'long life', but merely life generally (iv.1,xvi.20,xxx.6). The same idea is contained in Ex.xx.12 (vide Bishop Colenso) 'Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy *days may be long* upon the ground which Jehovah thy God giveth thee'; also in Ex.xxiii.25-6 'Ye shall serve Jehovah thy God, and he shall bless thy bread and thy water, and I will remove sickness from among thee. There shall nothing be bereaved of young, nor be barren, in thy land; and the *number of thy days I will fulfil*', (both Mosaic). Nowhere alluded to in Jeremiah.

(5.) "That the statutes &c., which Moses had taught them, were those which Jehovah had 'commanded to teach them' that they might 'do them in the land which Jehovah gave them', iv.5,14,v.31,vi.1, xii.1."

Ans. The last of these passages (xii.1) makes no mention of Moses being 'commanded to teach them'. Both ideas occur frequently in the earlier books, only not together (see Ex.xxiv.12,xxxv.1,4,Lev.xiv.34, xxvi.46,xxvii.34,Nu.xv.2,18,22-3,xxx.16,xxxiii.51,xxxv.10,xxxvi.13, nearly all Mosaic). Neither are alluded to in Jeremiah.

(6.) "That Mount Sinai 'burned with fire', and Jehovah spake 'out of the midst of the fire' iv.11,12,15,33,36,v.4,5,22,23,24,25,26,ix.10,15,x.4, xviii.16,xxxiii.2; it is mentioned in Ex.xix.18, that Jehovah 'descended on the mount in fire', and in Ex.xxiv.17 that 'the appearance of the glory of Jehovah was like devouring fire'; but it is added; 'He called unto Moses *out of the midst of the cloud*', and not, as in Deuteronomy, '*out of the midst of the fire*'."

Ans. Five of the verses referred to in Deuteronomy merely allude to the mountain burning with fire, without reference to the voice proceeding from it (iv.11,v.25,ix.15,xviii.16,xxxiii.2). It is to be observed, that it is not stated in Exodus that the voice of Jehovah *when giving the law* came 'out of the cloud', but merely that there was 'a heavy cloud upon the mountain, and the voice of a trumpet exceeding strong' (xix.16); that 'mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because Jehovah went down upon it in fire, and the smoke thereof went up as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount trembled greatly; and the voice of the trumpet went on stronger and stronger. Moses spake and God answered him by a voice' (*v.*18-9); and that 'all the people saw the thunderings, and the flaming torches, and the voice of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking' (xx.18, all Mosaic). From which it is plain, that the voice did come to the people 'out of the midst of the fire'. It is only when Moses' ascent of the mount is mentioned, that stress is laid upon the 'thick cloud' that encircled the immediate presence of the Deity.

But again, it would have been but fair to mention, that in Deuteronomy also the 'cloud' is twice spoken of in the most explicit terms, iv.11, 'and the mountain burned with fire unto the midst of heaven, *with darkness, clouds, and dark clouds*', and v.22-3, 'These words Jehovah spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, *of the cloud, and of the thick cloud*, with a great voice. . . . . And it came to pass when ye heard the voice *out of the midst of the darkness*, for the mountain was consuming with fire' &c. Both narratives are clearly at one; only as the fire (which included indeed the *smoke*, or cloudy darkness) was that which made most impression on the people, it was naturally oftenest mentioned by Moses when recalling their past history to mind. Jeremiah never so much as alludes to the giving of the law.

(7.) "That Jehovah would 'inherit' Israel, iv.20,ix.26,29,xxxii.9."

Ans. In these verses Israel is called God's 'inheritance'. The same

phrase is used in Ex.xxxiv.9 (vide Bishop Colenso) 'take us for *thine inheritance*', compare also xv.17, 'the mountain of thine inheritance', (both Mosaic). It occurs several times in Jeremiah, but mostly of the land, and not the people.

(8.) "That they should not when 'fat' and full with the good things of Canaan, 'corrupt themselves' &c. iv.25,vi.10,&c.,viii.10,&c.,xi.15, &c.,xxxi.20,xxxii.15,&c."

Ans. The first of these passages (iv.25) has nothing to do with the good things of Canaan at all. It was surely unnecessary to give such warnings until shortly before their entrance into the promised land. Jeremiah never charges the people with having done what is here forbidden, although he often denounces their luxuriousness generally.

(9.) "That idolatry in every form is specially 'abomination to Jehovah', iv.25,xi.16,xxvii.15,xxviii.36,64,xxix.17,xxx.17,xxxi.16,20, xxxii.16,17."

Ans. There is absolutely only *one* of these passages which contains the phrase in question (xxvii.15), in two others idols are spoken of as 'abominable things' (xxix.17,xxxii.16), the rest are merely general prohibitions of idolatry, while two are purely predictive (xxviii.36,64). It is scarcely necessary to remark, that idolatry is quite as strictly prohibited in the earlier laws, as in the later, and was to be punished by death (Ex.xx.4-6,23,xxii.20,xxiii 24,xxxiv.14,17,Lev.xix.4,xx.2-5, all Mosaic). Common also in Jeremiah.

(10.) "That Jehovah is to be served with inward, spiritual worship, 'with all the heart, and all the soul', iv.29,vi.5,x.12,xi.13,xiii.3,xxvi. 16,xxx.2,6,10."

Ans. Not mentioned in the earlier books, but frequently alluded to by Jeremiah; by whom, however, it is regarded as the characteristic of the *new covenant*, to be made after the restoration, and not, as here, of the old (see Jer.xxxi.33-4,xxxii.39-40, &c.).

(11.) "That Jehovah had 'chastened' (instructed) them, as a father his child, iv.36,viii.5,xi.2."

Ans. One out of these three passages (xi.2) refers to the chastisement of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, not of Israel. The remaining two refer, one to the *instruction* given at Mount Sinai, the other to the trials of the wilderness. That such solitary phrases should not be elsewhere repeated is not to be wondered at. Jeremiah affords numerous parallels for the general idea, but none for either of these special instances.

(12.) "That Jehovah would 'drive out', iv.38,ix.4,5,xi.23,xviii. 12, 'cast out' vi.19,vii.1,22,ix.4, 'deliver' vii.2,23,xxxi.5, 'destroy' vii.23,viii.20,ix.3,xxxi.3, 'cut off' xii.29,xix.1, the nations before Israel."

Ans. The same is continually set forth in the earlier books (see Ex. xxiii.23,27-31,xxxiii.2,xxxiv.11,Lev.xx.23, all Mosaic, also Nu.xxxii. 21, Moses' words). It would of course be more frequently insisted on as the time approached for them to enter on their conquest. Jeremiah never alludes to the overthrow of the ancient Canaanites.

(13.) "That Jehovah had brought out Israel 'by temptations, signs, wonders, &c.' iv.34,vi.22,vii.19,xi.3,xxvi.8,xxix.2,3."

Ans. This is also clearly stated in Ex.iii.20,vi.6,vii.3-4, (all Mosaic), see also Ex.xi.9-10,xxxii.11. Mentioned by Jeremiah.

(14.) "That Israel should hear and observe to do Jehovah's commands, that 'it might be well with them,' and that they might be multiplied, &c.,vi.3,vii.13,viii.1,xiii.17,xxviii.63,xxx.5,16."

Ans. Again we have an exact parallel in Lev.xxvi.3-10, comp. also Ex.xv.26, and the references in (4) and (19). Restoration to former blessings is frequently spoken of by Jeremiah as the reward of obedience.

(15.) "That Israel should 'fear' Jehovah, vi.24,viii.6,xiv.23,xxviii. 58."

Ans. Not directly enjoined in the earlier books, though the people did 'fear' Jehovah on more than one occasion (see Ex.xiv.31,xx.20 both Mosaic). Often alluded to in Jeremiah.

(16.) "That Israel should 'smite' vii.2, 'exterminate' vii.2,xx.17, 'devour,' vii.16, 'destroy with a mighty destruction,' vii.23, 'drive out and destroy,' ix.3, 'leave nothing alive of,' xx.16, the inhabitants of Canaan."

Ans. The same is said in Ex.xxiii.31,Nu.xxxiii.52-3 (both Mosaic), compare also (12) and (20). Nowhere referred to by Jeremiah.

(17.) "That the nations of Canaan would be likely to turn the Israelites to idolatrous practices, vii.4,xii.30,xx.18."

Ans. Similar warnings are given in Ex.xxiii.32-3,xxxiv.12-3,15-6, see also Nu.xxxiii.52,55 (all Mosaic). The origin of idolatry from such connection is never mentioned by Jeremiah.

(18.) "That Israel is 'holy unto Jehovah,' above all nations upon earth, vii.6,x.15,xiv.2,21,xxvi.19."

Ans. One of these passages (x.15) has nothing whatever to do with Israel's holiness, but simply with their being *chosen*. The idea of their peculiar sanctity is frequently mentioned in the earlier books (see Ex. xix.5-6,xxii.31,Lev.xi.44-5,xix.2,xx.7,24-6, all Mosaic). It is also found in Jeremiah.

(19.) "That Jehovah would 'bless' them, if obedient, with plentiful supplies of food and all earthly blessings, vii.12-5,xi.13-5,xxviii. 1-14."

Ans. This is little more than a repetition, in another form, of (4) and (14), which see. Parallel passages may be found in Ex.xxiii.25-6, Lev.xxv.18-9,xxvi.3-12 (all Mosaic).

(20.) "That no man should 'stand' before Israel, vii.24,xi.25,comp. ix.2."

Ans. This last passage refers to the Anakim, not the Israelites. The same idea occurs in Lev.xxvi.7-8 (Mosaic). The particular word used (יָצַב) is not to be found in this sense either in the earlier books or in Jeremiah.

(21.) "That Jehovah would 'go before' them, and lead them into the promised land, ix.3,xxxi.3."

Ans. Occurs still more frequently in the earlier books, see Ex.xxiii. 20-3,xxxii.34,xxxiii.2 (all Mosaic). Is not to be found in Jeremiah.

(22.) "That great impression may be expected to be made by capital punishments, xiii.11,xvii.13,xix.20,xxi.21."

Ans. Capital punishments are continually mentioned in the earlier legislation, but without any special note of the effect they were likely to produce. Nor is there a word of the kind in Jeremiah.

We may classify the results of these inquiries as follows :—Out of the 22 alleged peculiarities in Deuteronomy, 12 are to be found as clearly in the earlier Mosaic writings, 4 partially, only 6 not at all; and of these 6, only one is adequately represented in Jeremiah, 3 partially; the remaining 2 are peculiar to Deuteronomy. Or perhaps better thus,—2 out of the 22 are not found in either the earlier books or Jeremiah, and must therefore be eliminated as cutting both ways; 7 out of the remaining 20 are only partially represented in either, viz. 4 in the Mosaic writings and 3 in Jeremiah; while of the 13 which are adequately represented, 6 are common to all three and so prove nothing, 6 are found only in Deuteronomy and the earlier books, one only in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. We have thus on the side of Moses 6 complete agreements and 4 partial ones, on the side of Jeremiah one complete agreement and 3 partial ones. It is manifest that so far from establishing Bishop Colenso's view, the peculiarities he has instanced tend quite the other way. It is more probable that Moses wrote Deuteronomy than Jeremiah. Some divergences from the earlier books there certainly are; but it would be strange, indeed, if in such a series of addresses, delivered at the close of his life, and just before the people were to enter into the promised land, there were not some peculiar phrases or new ideas, not to be found in his previous writings.

But it may be said, how was it likely that Jeremiah in his prophecies should have mentioned these particulars concerning the Exodus and conquest of Canaan which characterize Deuteronomy? Most true; it was excessively unlikely that he should do so. But then how came he to write Deuteronomy at all? If

he had thought that these points were of little importance to the people of his days, how came he to spend so much time and labour in establishing them in a fictitious, but splendidly written volume? According to Bishop Colenso's theory, the book of Deuteronomy is supposed to have been written by Jeremiah in consequence of the failure of his predecessors in effecting a national reformation, as a more potent weapon, a higher authority, than his own avowed prophecies. He is supposed to have 'adapted it to the present circumstances of the times', and have written such a summary of the narrative and law as he believed Moses 'would have delivered, if now present with his people'. He derived his information from earlier writings on the same subject, but perceiving these to be 'not well suited for the present necessity' he expanded some ideas, and superadded many more, that it might produce the desired effect upon the people (p.426). And thus it came about that the book which he wrote differed very materially both in subject-matter, sentiment, and phraseology, from these earlier works. It is clear, then, that (according to this theory) he must have regarded these additions and alterations as peculiarly suited for the times in which he lived; or else what motive could he have had for making them? But if so, then why did he not use them in his prophecies, some of which were written before, others contemporaneous with, Deuteronomy (p.419)? He *does* make frequent reference to the Exodus, the passage through the wilderness, the covenant; more frequent reference indeed than any other prophet. His whole tone and phraseology shew that he was a diligent student of the Pentateuch. Abundant opportunities occur for the insertion of such peculiarities of sentiment as are said to distinguish Deuteronomy from the other books. Is it conceivable, then, that he, the author of Deuteronomy, who had inserted these peculiarities as specially suitable to his own times, should have yet failed to avail himself of them in his avowed prophecies? Yet how stands the case? Out of 22 alleged peculiarities of sentiment in Deu-

teronomy, only 10 find any representative in his prophecies; and of these, 6 are no peculiarities at all, but are common to the whole Pentateuch, so that it is impossible to say from which part he may have drawn them, 3 are only partially repeated, and so there is actually but *one* which appears to be peculiar to both Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. And that one is 'that Israel should *fear* Jehovah,' an idea so common in all the later writers, that its occurrence in Deuteronomy might as rightfully be used as an argument for David's or Isaiah's authorship as for Jeremiah's.

3. The next division of Bishop Colenso's argument consists of '*expressions common throughout the first four books of the Pentateuch, but never employed by the Deuteronomist.*'

1. "אֲחֻזָּה 'possession,' Gen.xvii.8,xxiii.4,9,20,xxxvi.43,xlvii.11, xlviii.4,xlix.30,l.13, Lev.xiv.34,34,xxv.10,13,24,25,27,28,32,33,33,34, 41,45,46,xxvii.16,21,22,24,28, Nu.xxvii.4,7,xxxii.5,22,29,32,xxxv.2,8, 28,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.49.

"Instead of אֲחֻזָּה, the Deut. uses always יְרֻשָּׁה, for 'possession' ii.5,9,9,12,19,19,iii.20,—which word is never used in the first four books of the Pentateuch, though the verb יָרַשׁ, 'inherit' occurs frequently, and the noun יְרֻשָּׁה 'possession' in Nu.xxiv.18."

Ans. All the instances of אֲחֻזָּה in Genesis are non-mosaic, occurring in Elohistic sections; 6 of those in Numbers are so also, belong to the later narrative; the remaining 23 occur in the laws of Leviticus and Numbers, which *may* have been merely written under Moses' direction, and so differ slightly from his own compositions in phraseology. The אֲחֻזָּה in Deut.xxxii.49 occurs in a *narrative* portion, the יְרֻשָּׁה in Nu.xxiv.18 in the history of Balaam, neither therefore Mosaic. The difference is certainly worthy of note. יְרֻשָּׁה occurs once in Jeremiah (xxxii.8).

(2.) "אִישׁ אִישׁ, 'every man,' lit. 'man, man,' Ex.xxxvi.4,Lev.xv.2, xvii.3,8,10,xviii.6,xx.2,9,xxii.4,18,Nu.i.4,iv.19,49,v.12,ix.10,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

"The Deut. uses *always* אִישׁ only, i.16,41,iii.20,xii.8,xvi.17,xviii. 19, xix.11,15,16, xxi.15,18,22, xxii.13,22,25,26,28, xxiii.11,xxiv.1,5,7, 16."

Ans. Four of the passages first named belong to the later narrator, and hence have nothing to do with the comparison. The remaining 13 must be divided into two classes, (i) those in which the phrase אִישׁ אִישׁ is equivalent to *every man*; (ii.) those in which it means *any man, whoever*. Of the first kind there is only one (Ex.xxxvi.4), while there are 15 cases in which the very same idea is expressed by the simple אִישׁ (Gen.xxxiv. 25, xlvii. 20, Ex. xii. 3, xvi. 16,16,21, xxxii. 27,27,27,27,29,

xxxiii.8,10,Lev.xix.3,Nu.xxxvi.7,9); 6 out of those named in Deuteronomy are of this kind; according to the proportion of the Mosaic usage in the other books, then, all these six should clearly be expressed in the way they are. Of the other kind there are 12 cases in the Mosaic writings where the double form is used, also 38 cases where the same idea is expressed by the simple form; so that here again it was more likely that the latter should be used in Deuteronomy than the former, though the number of cases found there (15) would have led one to expect that sometimes the double form would be used. It is to be noted that all the 12 cases of אִישׁ אִישׁ in this second sense, contained in the Mosaic writings, are in the later legislation, whose authorship is most doubtful. The simple form is universally employed by Jeremiah.

(3.) "גָּוַע, 'die', Gen.vi.17,vii.21,xxv.8,17,xxxv.29,xlix.33,Nu.xvii. 27,28,xx.3,29,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*"

Ans. None of these passages are Mosaic; those in Genesis belonging to Elohistic sections, those in Numbers to the later narrator. So that the usage of the earlier Mosaic writings and Deuteronomy is in this respect identical. The word occurs once in Jeremiah's writings (Lam.i.19).

(4.) "מַטֶּה 'tribe', 96 times in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

"The Deut. uses *always* שֵׁבֶט, for 'tribe', (18 times)."

Ans. 58 out of these 96 are non-mosaic; only 6 occur in Exodus, the rest are in the later legislation; שֵׁבֶט also occurs twice in Exodus (xxviii.21,xxxix.14), so that it was not by any means unknown to Moses. Neither occur in Jeremiah, who always uses the expression 'house' instead of 'tribe'.

(5.) "בְּעֶצֶם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה (lit. 'in the bone of this day' =) 'on the self-same day', Gen.vii.13,xvii.23,26,Ex.xii.17,41,51,Lev.xxiii.14,21,28, 29,30,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy* except xxxii.48."

Ans. Four of these instances are non-mosaic (Gen.vii.13,xvii.23,26, Ex.xii.51), five others are in the later legislation, two only in the Mosaic narrative of the Exodus. The same idea is much more commonly conveyed by the simple demonstrative זֶה. In Deuteronomy there is no passage where such emphasis is required, except xxxii.48, but this is in a narrative section and therefore probably non-mosaic. The phrase does not occur in Jeremiah.

(6.) "'gathered to his people' = die, Gen.xxv.8,17,xxxv.29,xlix. 29,33,Nu.xx.24,26,xxvii.13,xxxi.2,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.50."

Ans. All these instances (including that in Deuteronomy) are non-mosaic; so that the usage of both portions is identical. The expression is not found in Jeremiah.

(7.) "'that *soul* shall be cut off' from Israel, from his people, Gen. xvii.14, Ex. xii.15,19,xxx.33,38,xxxi. 14, Lev. vii. 20,21,25,27,xvii.4,9, xviii.29,xix.8,xx.17,18,xxii.3,xxiii.29,Nu.ix.13,xv.30,xix.13,20, — *nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

"The Deut. says *always* 'that *man* shall die' or 'shall be stoned with stones', and 'thou shalt put away (lit. 'burn up') the evil from the midst of you', xiii.5,xvii.7,12,xix.13,19,xxi.9,21,xxii.21,22,24,xxiv.7."

Ans. The first instance quoted is non-mosaic (Gen.xvii.14) 16 others belong to the later legislation, 5 only to Exodus. Several things have here to be noted.

(i) The expression 'that soul shall be cut off' does not seem generally to refer to any punishment inflicted by *man*. Lev.xvii.8-10 'Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel &c. that offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice, and bringeth it not unto the entrance of the tabernacle of the Congregation &c. even that *man* (not 'soul') *shall be cut off from among his peoples*. And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel &c. that eateth any blood, *I will even set my face* against that soul that eateth blood, and *will cut him off from among his peoples*.' Lev.xx.6 'The soul that turneth to familiar spirits &c. *I will even set my face* against that soul, and *will cut him off from among his people*', (see also *v.*5). Lev.xxiii.29-30 'For whatsoever soul it be that shall not fast in that same day, *he shall be cut off from among his peoples*. And whatsoever soul it be that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul *will I destroy from among his people*.' Here punishment by God, and being 'cut off from among his people', are clearly synonymous terms. In Lev.xxii.3 and Nu.xix.20 again it merely refers to exclusion from the sanctuary. Only in Ex.xxxi.14 does it seem to refer to capital punishment.

(ii) When capital punishment *is* intended, the phrase most commonly employed is 'shall surely be put to death'; this occurs 25 times in Mosaic passages. We have also 'doomed to death' Ex.xxii.20; 'burnt with fire' Lev.xx.14,xxi.9. Stoning is mentioned in Lev.xx. 2,27,xxiv.16 (Mosaic) and Nu.xiv.10,xv.35 (non-mosaic).

(iii) In Deuteronomy we find 'stone with stones' 5 times; 'shall die' 5 times; 'put to death' 4 times; 'kill him' once; 'put away the evil' (generally in connection with one of the preceding) 11 times.

It appears thus that both portions vary considerably in their usage, and are by no means so unlike as would at first sight appear to be the case. Still it must be admitted that two at least of the phrases, 'shall be cut off &c.' and 'put away the evil &c.' are peculiar, and respectively characteristic of the earlier books and Deuteronomy. Neither of them are to be found in Jeremiah.

(8.) "חֹק, or חֻקָּה, 'ordinance', in the *singular*, Ex.xv.25,xxx.21, Lev.vi.11,15,vii.34,x.15,Nu.xviii.8,11,19,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*."

Ans. We have here two forms of the same word. The first חֹק, which is masculine, is found in the earlier Mosaic writings 7 times in the singular, twice in the plural (חֻקִּים); in Deuteronomy 15 times in the plural (also once in a narrative section); in Jeremiah once in the singular (v.22), and twice in the plural (xxxi.36,xxxii.11). The second חֻקָּה, which is feminine, is found in the earlier Mosaic writings 21 times in the singular, 13 times in the plural (חֻקּוֹת); in Deuteronomy 8 times in the plural; in Jeremiah 5 times in the plural (x.3,

xxxi.35,xxxiii.25,xliv.10,23). It is not therefore a question of whether or not a particular word was known and used by the Deuteronomist, or Moses, or Jeremiah; since both the words in question are used by all three. It is merely a question of whether they used them in the *singular* or the *plural!* A matter which must clearly depend entirely upon the subject-matter of their writings. Moses in his earlier compositions, having to speak chiefly of particular laws, uses the singular oftener than the plural. The Deuteronomist, having to speak of laws generally, uses the plural exclusively. Jeremiah comes between the two, and uses the singular once and the plural 7 times. Neither could have done otherwise, had their positions been reversed.

(9.) "'land of Canaan' Gen. (35 times), Ex.vi.4,xvi.35,Lev.xiv. 34,xviii.3,xxv.38, Nu.xiii.2,17,xxvi.19,xxxii.30,32,xxxiii.40,51, xxxiv. 2,2,29,xxxv.10,14—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.49.

"The Deut. uses twice the expression 'land of the Canaanites' i.7, xi.30; but he generally uses some periphrasis, such as the 'land which Jehovah sware unto your fathers', i.8,35,vi.10,18,23,viii.1,&c., the 'good land', iii.25,iv.21,22,vi.18,viii.7,10,&c., the 'land which Jehovah giveth thee', iv.1,21,v.31,&c., the 'land whither ye go over to possess it', iv.5,14,26,vi.1,vii.1,&c., the 'land that floweth with milk and honey', vi.3,xi.9,xxvi.15,&c."

Ans. Out of the 35 cases alleged in Genesis, 28 are in Elohistic sections; of the others also Ex.xvi.35,Nu.xiii.2,17,xxvi.19,xxxii. 30,32, must be omitted as non-mosaic. This leaves 18 instances, viz. 7 in the Jehovistic sections of Genesis, one in Exodus, 3 in Leviticus, and 7 in Numbers. No other term could well be substituted in Genesis, 4 of the instances occurring in the early history of Abram, 3 in the account of Joseph's legislation concerning the famine; nor could it well be omitted in Ex.vi.4, where the original promise of the land is repeated and confirmed. The other instances occur in the later legislation, which as already observed is not so certainly Mosaic (so far, that is, as *phraseology* is concerned) as the narratives of Genesis and Exodus, more especially the latter.

But besides this phrase 'land of Canaan', we find in these earlier books also the following.—In Genesis: 'land that I will shew thee' (xii.1), 'land which thou seest' (xiii.15), 'land whereon thou liest' (xxviii.13), 'land of the Hebrews' (xl.15). In Exodus: 'land of their (fathers') sojournings' (vi.4), 'land which he sware that he would give them' (vi.8,xiii.5,xxxiii.1), 'land which he would give them' (xii.25), 'land of the Canaanites' (xiii.11), 'land of the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites &c.' (iii.8,17,xiii.5). In Leviticus and Numbers: 'land which he would give them' (Lev.xxiii.10,xxv.2,Nu. xv.2), besides others in the non-mosaic portions. The phrase 'flowing with milk and honey' is found more frequently in the first four books than in Deuteronomy (see Ex.iii.8,17,xiii.5,xxxiii.3, Mosaic; and Nu.xiii.27,xiv.8,xvi.13,14, non-mosaic); 'good land' is also found in Ex.iii.8. It is clear, then, that such periphrases were well known to

Moses, and indeed more commonly employed by him than the expression 'land of Canaan'. That with the land before their eyes, and on the eve of entering upon its conquest, he should have employed them still more freely, and added some (*e.g.* 'land whither thou goest to possess it') peculiarly appropriate to the occasion, but unsuitable before, is no more than his previous custom would have led us to expect.

The solitary instance of 'land of Canaan' in Deuteronomy (xxxii. 4-9) is in a narrative section, and so probably non-mosaic. The two cases of 'land of the Canaanites' (i.17,xi.30), both seem to refer to particular *portions* of the land, where the tribe of Canaanites proper (as distinguished from the Hittites, Amorites &c.) dwelt. Jeremiah never speaks of the 'land of Canaan', a term indeed which could scarcely have been known in his days, but generally uses the phrase 'land which I gave them' &c.

(10.) "פַּר 'bullock' occurs 9 times in Exodus, 29 times in Leviticus, 52 times in Numbers,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

"The Deut. uses *always* שׁוֹר, for bullock, v.14,18,xiv.4,xv.19,xvii.1, xviii.3,xxii.1,4,10,xxv.4,xxviii.31,xxxiii 17."

Ans. About half of the cases in Numbers and 3 of those in Leviticus are non-mosaic. Both words are used by Moses; שׁוֹר occurs in Exodus 21 times, or more than twice as often as פַּר; in the Mosaic parts of Leviticus and Numbers 5 times. There may perhaps be a difference of signification between them. Thus in Lev.viii., the account of Aaron's consecration by Moses, פַּר is used throughout; in ix., the account of Aaron's first sacrifices, שׁוֹר. Jeremiah uses פַּר once (l.27), שׁוֹר never.

(11.) "עַרְבוֹת מוֹאָב 'plains of Moab', Nu.xxii.1,xxvi.3,63,xxxi.12, xxxiii.48,49,50,xxxv.1,xxxvi.13,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxiv.1,8.

"The Deut. uses '*land* of Moab' i.5,ii.9,xxix.1,xxxii.49,xxxiv.5,6."

Ans. Four of the instances referred to in Numbers are certainly non-mosaic (xxii.1,xxvi.3,63,xxxi.12), three others are doubtful (xxxiii.50,xxxv.1,xxxvi.13), the remaining two are in the list of journeyings, and are therefore unquestionably Mosaic. One of the instances quoted from Deuteronomy (ii.9) does not contain the phrase 'land of Moab' at all, but simply speaks of the Moabites, and the command not to invade 'their land'. All the others are in narrative sections, and so probably non-mosaic. Jeremiah, having no occasion to refer to that particular part of Moab, does not use the phrase 'plains'; 'land of Moab' occurs in xlviii.24,33.

(12.) "עֵדָה, 'congregation', 15 times in Exodus, 12 times in Leviticus, 83 times in Numbers,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

"The Deut. uses *always* קָהָל, 'assembly', v.19,ix.10,x.4,xviii.16, xxiii.2,3,3,4,4,9,xxxi.30."

Ans. 74 of the instances in Numbers, and 7 of those in Leviticus are non-mosaic. This leaves 29 cases in the Mosaic sections. The

other term קָהָל is also found twice in Exodus, once alone (xvi.3), and once in conjunction with עֵדָה (xii.6), 4 times in Leviticus, and 3 times in Numbers. One of the instances in Deuteronomy is non-mosaic (xxxi.30). There was probably some difference in meaning which determined the use of these two terms.* Jeremiah uses them both, עֵדָה twice (vi.18,xxx.20), קָהָל 5 times (xxvi.17,xxxi.8,xliv.15,l.9, Lam.i.10).

(13) "אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, 'tent of the congregation', occurs 34 times in Exodus, 43 times in Leviticus, 56 times in Numbers;

"מִשְׁכָּן 'Tabernacle', 56 times in Exodus, 3 times in Leviticus, (and once *metaphorically* Lev.xxvi.11), 38 times in Numbers;

"עֵדוּת, Testimony, 35 times in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers;

"קָרְבָּן, 'offering', 78 times in Leviticus and Numbers;

"but not one of these expressions is used by the Deuteronomist, though the first occurs in Deut.xxxi.14,14, and אֹהֶל in *v.*15,15."

Ans. These are all technical terms, whose absence may fairly be accounted for from the fact, that the Deuteronomist did not require to allude to any of the things of which they are the names. Had he been writing a fictitious history, which he wished to be regarded as true, it is most unlikely that he should have refrained from inserting such terms as the first two especially, which would have given his work a greater air of reality. It will be seen also that the words in question are very unequally distributed throughout the earlier books, מִשְׁכָּן being found only 4 times in Leviticus, עֵדוּת only twice, קָרְבָּן not at all in Exodus. In further illustration of the curious arguments which a purely mechanical criticism like this, might found upon such divergences in phraseology, the following list of technical names of sacrifices may be interesting:

זֶבַח, 'sacrifice',	Gen. 0;	Ex. 5;	Lev. 32;	Nu. 18;	Dt. 6;	Jer. 4.
מִנְחָה, 'oblation',	— 3;	— 3;	— 35;	— 56;	— 0;	— 3.
עֹלָה, 'burnt-offering',	— 7;	— 13;	— 59;	— 53;	— 5;	— 6.
תְּרוּמָה, 'heave-offering',	— 0;	— 14;	— 3;	— 14;	— 0;	— 0.
נְדָבָה, 'free-will-offering',	— 0;	— 2;	— 4;	— 2;	— 4;	— 0.
אִשֶּׁה, 'fire-offering',	— 0;	— 3;	— 41;	— 14;	— 1;	— 0.
שְׁלָמִים, 'feast-offering',	— 0;	— 4;	— 30;	— 18;	— 1;	— 0.
נֶסֶךְ, 'drink-offering',	— 1;	— 3;	— 3;	— 29;	— 1;	— 7.
חַטָּאת, 'sin-offering',	— 0;	— 3;	— 59;	— 32;	— 0;	— 0.
תְּנוּפָה, 'wave-offering',	— 0;	— 4;	— 9;	— 4;	— 0;	— 0.
אָשָׁם, 'guilt-offering',	— 0;	— 0;	— 24;	— 2;	— 0;	— 0.
קָרְבָּן, 'offering',	— 0;	— 0;	— 35;	— 36;	— 0;	— 0.

Out of these 12 terms, 9 are absent from Genesis, 2 from Exodus, 6 from Deuteronomy, 8 from Jeremiah. It is manifest that it is the *subject* which determines all this, and not the *authors*.

---

* See Benisch's Reply to Colenso Pt.I.,p.13-6.

Lev.xxvi. is regarded by Bishop Colenso as a Deuteronomistic interpolation; he is naturally therefore anxious to give the מִשְׁכָּן which occurs in it a 'metaphorical' sense. Few readers probably, who examined the passage impartially, would perceive aught of *metaphor* in the statement, that among other blessings upon obedience, God would 'set his Tabernacle amongst' them.

Omitting this last group of peculiarities, then, as irrelevant, we may sum up the result of our inquiries as to the other 12 as follows. In three of them, (3), (6), (11), one element of the comparison is a phrase never occurring in Moses' writings, and they are hence of no weight at all in deciding the point at issue. One (8) depends upon words common to both the earlier books and Deuteronomy, but which are used by the latter only in the plural, in the former in both singular and plural, which cannot fairly be called a divergence. Five out of the remaining eight, (2), (4), (5), (10), (12), are cases where out of *many* phrases employed in the earlier books, the Deuteronomist has made use of one only. In three of these, (2), (5) and (10), his usage is closely similar to that observed in Exodus, in another (4) more like that than the other books. Jeremiah differs from him in three of these (4), (10), (12), agrees with him in two (2), (5). The remaining three cases (1), (7), (9), are real differences, more or less marked; one (9) is very slight and quite explicable by the altered circumstances of the times; one (7) is somewhat more decisive; the other (1) unmistakeable, but only applicable to the later books. Jeremiah agrees with Deuteronomy on the first, differs on the second, agrees on the third (1).

The comparison just completed furnishes us, then, with no decisive evidence of divergence in phraseology between Exodus and Deuteronomy, it merely throws a little doubt upon the direct Mosaic authorship of the laws recorded in Leviticus and Numbers, exhibits also several discordances between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, quite as striking as those alleged to exist between the former and the first four books of the Pentateuch.

4. Bishop Colenso next presents us with a list of ten '*expressions used freely by the Deuteronomist, but never occurring in the first four books of the Pentateuch.*'

(1.) "'land of Moab,' i.5,ii.9,xxix.1,xxxii.49,xxxv.5,6."

Ans. As already remarked, one of these passages (ii.9) does not contain the phrase at all, while the others are all in narrative sections (see p.168).

(2.) "הִנְחִיל, 'make to inherit,' i.38,iii.28,xii.10,xix.3,xxi.16,xxxi.7, xxxii.8; but נָחַל 'inherit,' is often used in the other books, as in Deut.xix.14."

Ans. A mere difference in grammatical form like this is but a poor ground for arguing diverse authorship. It is one too which Bishop Colenso does not regard in other cases as in any way destructive of parallelism. When he wants to shew a parallel to the Deuteronomistic דָּבַק, 'cleave,' he does not hesitate to quote a Hiphil form (Jer.xiii.11). If the parallelism be good there, why not here? 'Make to inherit' occurs twice in Jeremiah (iii.18,xii.14).

(3.) "'go in to possess,' 'come in, go in, go over, and possess', i.8, iv. 1,5,14,22,26, vi.1,18, vii.1, viii.1,ix.1,5,x.11,xi.8,10,11,29,31,xii.29, xvii.14,xxiii.20,xxvi.1,xxviii.21,63,xxx.16,18,xxxi.13,xxxii.47; comp. i.21,39,ix.4,23,xxx.5."

Ans. Very natural phrases to be used at such a time; inappropriate before. That the idea of *possession*, however, was no novelty may be seen by reference to such passages as Lev.xx.24,xxv.24,Nu.xxxiii.53, xxxv.2 (all Mosaic; comp. also Nu.xxvi.56,xxxii.5). A similar phrase is found in Jer.xxxii.23.

(4.) "'that they may learn to fear Jehovah,' &c., iv.10,xiv.23, xvii.19,xxxi,12,13."

Ans. The exact phrase is not contained either in the earlier books or in Jeremiah. The idea, however, as before remarked, is common in the latter (see p.161).

(5.) "'out of the midst of the fire,' iv.12,15,33,36,v.4,22,24,26, ix.10,x.4."

Ans. The discrepancy supposed to exist on this head between Deuteronomy and the other books has been fully considered before (p.159). The expression does not occur in Jeremiah.

(6.) "'which Jehovah giveth thee for an inheritance' &c. (used of the land of Canaan), iv.21,38,xv.4,xix.10,xx.16,xxi.23,xxiv.4,xxv.19, xxvi.1."

Ans. In Ex.vi.8, we have 'and I will give it you for an heritage'; comp. also Ex.xxxii.13.Nu.xxxiii.54,xxxiv.2,13 (all Mosaic). 'Thine inheritance that I gave thee' occurs in Jer.xvii.4.

(7.) "'remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt', v.15,xv.15,xvi.12,xxiv.18,22; comp. x.19."

Ans. Egypt is called the 'house of servants' in Ex.xiii.3,14,xx.2

(also Deut.vi.12,viii.14,xiii.5,10); the people are spoken of as Jehovah's 'servants, whom he brought forth out of Egypt' in Lev. xxv.42,55; while in Lev.xxvi.13 God says, 'I am Jehovah your God, who brought you forth out of the land of Egypt, *that ye should not be their servants.*' Deut.x.19 makes mention of their being 'strangers in Egypt'; exactly parallel with which are Ex.xxii.21,xxiii.9,Lev. xix.34. 'House of servants' occurs once in Jeremiah (xxxiv.13), but neither of the other phrases.

(8.) "הַמִּצְוָה, 'all the commandment,' v.28,vi.25,viii.1,xi.8,22, xv.5,xix.9,xxvii.1,xxxi.5,—*nowhere else in the Bible;* but we find מִצְוֹת Lev.iv.2,13,22,v.17,Nu.xv.39,Deut.v.26,&c., הַמִּצְוֹת Nu. xv.22."

Ans. The difference between these three forms is simply this: The first is singular, with the article; the second is plural, without the article; the third plural, with the article. A curious sign of diverse authorship forsooth! None of the phrases occur in Jeremiah.

(9.) "'words of this Law,' xvii.19,xxvii.3,8,26,xxviii.58,xxix.29, xxxi.12,24,xxxii.46."

Ans. The first of these passages refers to the law of the *kingdom*, the others to the 10 commandments and the blessings and cursings recorded in xxvii.-viii. &c. (see p.158). Not found in Jeremiah, the passage referred to by Bishop Colenso, vi.19, being merely 'they have not attended to my words, nor to my law."

(10.) "'written in this Book, in this Book of the Law,' &c., xxviii.58,61,xxix.20,21,27,xxx.10."

Ans. Again refers merely to the last address in Deuteronomy, which Moses wrote in a book, and gave to the Levites. Not found in Jeremiah, albeit Bishop Colenso refers to a passage as parallel (!) where mention is made of certain 'words' of Jeremiah 'against all the nations', which also were 'written' in a 'book' (xxv.13).

These instances Bishop Colenso himself admits to be of little weight, on account of their 'reference to the special circumstances, under which Moses is supposed to be addressing the people.' Independently of this, however, they are very weak. Three (1), (4), (5) are merely repetitions of discrepancies previously considered, and in two cases (1), (5) amply refuted. Two (2), (8) involve no discrepancies at all, but are mere grammatical quibbles. Two more (6), (7) *do* find a parallel in the earlier books. Two others (9), (10) refer to things of later date than these. The remaining one (3) is partially paralleled, and fully accounted for by the special circumstances of the time. Only

five are in any way paralleled by Jeremiah, but of these two are repetitions (1) (4), one a grammatical quibble (2), one is far more fully paralleled in Exodus (6), the other partially so in several passages in the earlier books, and arising from the altered circumstances (3); in this latter too, we may observe, that *one* passage in Jeremiah is accounted equal to 29 in Deuteronomy, and this *resemblance* between them becomes an argument for common authorship!

5. The most important evidence adduced by Bishop Colenso in favour of the diverse authorship of Deuteronomy and the earlier books, and the ascription of the former to Jeremiah, is contained in a list of 23 '*additional Deuteronomistic expressions, which never occur in the first four books of the Pentateuch.*'

(1.) "נָתַן לִפְנֵיהֶם, 'set before the face' = 'deliver up' an enemy, their land, &c., i.8,21,ii.31,33,36, vii.2,23, xxiii.14, xxxi.5; comp. xxviii.7,25."

Ans. In the first two passages, the phrase is used in its natural, literal meaning without any reference to 'delivering up.' The phrase occurs in Jeremiah several times (ix.12, xxi.8, xxvi.4, xxxv.5, xliv.10), but *never* in the sense of 'deliver up,' albeit Bishop Colenso heads this list of references with the words, "'set before the face,'—'deliver up.'" It is used once of placing pots of wine before the Rechabites (xxxv.5); the other four times of laws and commandments, a sense in which it also occurs in Deut.xi.32, xxx.1,15,19, and (with the substitution of שִׂים, 'place,' for נָתַן, 'give,') Ex.xxi.1.

(2.) "יְרֻשָּׁה, 'possession,' ii.5,9,9,12,19,19, iii.20."

Ans. Already considered (p.164). It occurs once in Jeremiah, (xxxii.8).

(3.) "'that Jehovah thy God may bless thee,' &c., ii.7, xii.7, xiv. 24,29, xv.4,6,10,14,18, xvi.10,15, xxiii.20, xxiv.19, xxx.16; comp. i.11, xxviii.8."

Ans. This is not properly a case of phraseology, but of sentiment. Only three of the passages referred to contain the exact phrase under which they are classed (xiv.29, xxiii.20, xxiv.19). Four are in the past tense 'Jehovah thy God *hath* blessed thee,' (ii.7, xii.7, xiv.24, xv.14); six are in the future (xv.4,6,10,18, xvi.15, xxx.16); one introduced with a comparison '*as* Jehovah thy God may bless thee' (xvi.10). The idea is common in the earlier Mosaic writings (see Gen.xii.2, xxiv.1,35, xxvi.3,12,24, Nu.vi.27, &c.). The nearest approach to a parallelism in Jeremiah (which is referred to by Bishop Colenso as if it were a complete one) is the imperative form 'Jehovah bless thee' (xxxi.23).

(4.) "'work of the hands,' ii.7,xiv.29,xvi.15, xxiv.19, xxvii.15, xxviii.12,xxx.9,xxxi.29."

Ans. This phrase is used in two very different senses, 1. the *labour* of the people (ii.7,xiv.29,xvi.15,xxiv.19, xxviii.12, xxx.9). 2. their *idols* (xxvii.15,xxxi.29). It occurs in Jeremiah, in the first sense *not at all*, in the second frequently (i.16,x.3,xxv.6,7,xxxii.30,xliv.8); also in the sense of their *doings* generally, twice (xxv.14,Lam.iii.64); and once in a purely literal sense (Lam.iv.2). It does not occur in the earlier Mosaic writings.

(5.) "לָמַד, 'learn,'iv.1,5,10,14,v.1,28,vi.1,xi.19,xiv.23,xvii.19,xxxi. 12,13."

Ans. Not in the earlier books, but commonly in Jeremiah (ii.33, ix.4,13,19,x.2,xii.16,16,16,xiii.21,xxxi.18,34,xxxii.33).

(6.) "דָּבַק, 'cleave' to Jehovah, iv.4,x.20,xi.22,xiii.5,xxx.20."

Ans. The word occurs also in Nu.xxxvi.7,9, though not with reference to Jehovah (comp.Deut.xiii.18,xxviii.21,60). It is found in Jeremiah only in xiii.11, 'as a girdle cleaveth to the loins of a man, so have I caused to cleave unto me the whole house of Israel,' &c. The verb is here used in the *Hiphil*, a distinction which elsewhere Bishop Colenso regards as destructive of parallelism (see p.171). But apart from this, it is manifest that the idea is very different from that conveyed by the passages in Deuteronomy; there the word signifies the *people's* adherence and allegiance to Jehovah, here *Jehovah's* adoption of them.

(7.) "גָּרַח, 'drive, force,' iv.19,xiii.6,11,14,xix.5,xx.19,xxii.1,xxx.1, 4,17."

Ans. Not in the earlier books, but commonly in Jeremiah (viii.3, xvi.15,xxiii.2,3,8,xxiv.9,xxvii.10,15, xxix.14,18, xxxii.37,xl.12,xliii.5, xlvi.28,xlix.5,36,l.17).

(8.) "כָּעַס 'provoke', iv.25,ix.18,xxxi.29,xxxii.16,19,21,21,27."

Ans. Not in the earlier books, but commonly in Jeremiah (vii.18,19, viii.19,xi.17,xxv.6,7,xxxii.29,30,32,xliv.3,8).

(9.) "'with all the heart and with all the soul', iv.29,vi.5,x.12, xi.13,xiii.3,xxvi.16,xxx.2,6,10."

Ans. Does not occur either in the earlier books or in Jeremiah. The phrase 'with their whole heart', is found in the latter three times (iii.10,xxiv.7,xxix.13), but nearly always with reference to the new covenant to be made hereafter (see p.160). In xxxii.41 we have 'with my whole heart, and with my whole soul', but this refers to Jehovah, not to Israel, and also has to do with the future.

(10.) "אָהַב, 'love', used of Jehovah loving Israel, iv.37,vii.8,13,x. 15,xxiii.6."

Ans. This again is a question of sentiment, and not of phraseology. The verb אָהַב is that universally employed for 'love', and is found commonly in the earlier books (Gen.xxiv.67,xxv.28,28,xxvii.4,9,14, xxix.18,30,32,Ex.xx.6,xxi.5,Lev.xix.18,all Mosaic; comp. Deut.v.10, vi.5,vii.9,x.12,19,xi.13,22,xiii.4,xv.16,xxx.16,20). It would there-

fore certainly have been used had their author wished to express the idea in question. It occurs once in Jeremiah for this end (xxxi.3).

(11.) "'walk in the ways of Jehovah', v.33,viii.6,x.12,xi.22, xix.9,xxvi.17,xxviii.9,xxx.16.

Ans. The exact phrase does not occur either in Jeremiah, or the earlier books. In the former we have 'walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you' (vii.23), but this is said with reference to the covenant in the wilderness, and must be regarded in the light of a *quotation*. In the latter we have three passages partially parallel, Ex.xvi.4 '*walk in* my law', Lev.xviii.4 'keep mine ordinances to *walk therein*', and xxvi.3 'if ye *walk in* my ordinances'.

(12.) "'forget Jehovah', vi.12,viii.11,14,19,xxxii.18; comp.iv.23."

Ans. Not found in the earlier books, but commonly in Jeremiah, (ii.32,iii.21,xiii.25,xviii.15,xxiii.27).

(13.) "פָּדָה, 'redeem', used *metaphorically* of delivering Israel from Egypt, &c., vii.8,ix.26,xiii.6,xv.15,xxi.8,xxiv.18."

Ans. Wherein the deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Egypt differs from a *literal* 'release' it is hard to see; the distinction is however essential to the argument, since פָּדָה occurs frequently in the earlier books in the same sense, though not with the same reference (see Ex.xiii.13,13,13,xxxiv.20,20,20,Lev.xix.20,xxvii.27,29). There is also another word גָּאַל which is used with the same two-fold reference in the earlier books (of Israel Ex.vi.6,xv.13, of redemption generally Lev.xxv.xxvii—18 times); occurs also in Jeremiah (xxxi.11,xxxii.7,8) but is not found in this sense in Deuteronomy. פָּדָה in its 'metaphorical' sense occurs twice in Jeremiah (xv.21,xxxi,11).

(14.) "'abomination to Jehovah', vii.25,xii.31,xvii.1,xviii.12, xxii.5,xxiii.18,xxv.16,xxvii.15."

Ans. The exact phrase does not occur either in the earlier books or in Jeremiah. The word 'abomination' is found however frequently in the latter, (ii.7,vi.15,vii.10,viii.12,xvi.18,xxxii.35,xliv.4,22); also in Leviticus (xviii.22,26,27,29,30; and comp.Ex.viii.26).

(15.) "'which thou knewest not', 'which thy fathers knew not', &c.viii.3,16,xi.28,xiii.2,6,13,xxviii.33,36,64,xxix.26,xxxi.13,xxxii,17; comp.vii.15,ix.2."

Ans. Not found in the earlier books, but commonly in Jeremiah (v.15,vii.9,ix.16,xiv.18,xv.14,xvi.13,xvii.4,xix.4,xxii.28,xliv.3).

(16.) "הֵיטֵב, 'thoroughly', ix.21,xiii.15,xvii.4,xix.18,xxvii.8."

Ans. Does not occur either in the earlier books or in Jeremiah. The instance referred to in the latter by Bishop Colenso as (perhaps) parallel, is not in point. It runs thus: 'If ye thoroughly amend (הֵיטֵיב תֵּיטִיבוּ) your ways and your doings; if ye thoroughly execute (עָשֹׂה תַּעֲשׂוּ) judgment' &c. (vii.5). The occurrence of הֵיטֵיב in the first clause (not הֵיטֵב as Bishop Colenso seems to assert) clearly depends, not on any adverbial sense belonging to itself, but on the fact of the verb הֵיטִיב being the principal one; the reduplication of the verb giving (according to the well-known Hebrew idiom) the

sense of completeness or certainty. Had it been otherwise, the next clause would surely have been written with וַיִּתֵּן also, but this is not the case, *its* verb being repeated in the same way, and the same intensity of meaning thereby produced.

(17.) "'the stranger and the fatherless and the widow' &c. x.18, xiv.29,xvi.11,14,xxiv.17,19,20,21,xxvi.12,13,xxvii.19."

Ans. The exact phrase does not occur in the earlier books, but comp.Ex.xxii.21-4; occasionally met with in Jeremiah (vii.6,xxii.3; comp.v.28,xlix.11).

(18.) "'a blessing and a curse', xi.26,xxx.1,19; and קְלָלָה, 'curse', xi.28,29,xxi.23,xxiii.5,xxvii.13,xxviii.15,45,xxix.26."

Ans. The first phrase is found in neither Jeremiah nor the earlier books, being used only of the special 'blessings and cursings' to be proclaimed at Mount Gerizzim, קְלָלָה 'curse' occurs frequently in Jeremiah, (xxiv.9,xxv.18,xxvi.6,xxix.22,xlii.18,xliv.8,12,22,xlix.13), but in a very different sense. In Deuteronomy it means either, 1. a malediction, an evil thing pronounced upon some one, as *about to happen* (xi.26,28,29,xxiii.5,xxvii.13,xxviii.15,45,xxix.26,xxx.1,19); or 2. an accursed thing (xxi.23). In Jeremiah it means neither of these, but either, 1. an occasion of cursing, an evil thing *actually present*, which might be used by way of comparison in cursing others (xxiv.9,xxv.18,xxvi.6,xlii.18,xliv.8,12,22,xlix.13); or 2. a *form* of malediction grounded upon such an evil thing (xxix.22). The word also occurs *twice* in the earlier Mosaic writings (*vide* Bishop Colenso), in precisely the same sense as in the majority of the passages in Deuteronomy (Gen.xxvii.12,13; comp. also for the use of the *verb* viii.21,xii.3,Ex.xxii.27,Lev.xix.14; all Mosaic).

(19.) "'eat before Jehovah', xii.7,18,xiv.23,26,xv.20,xxvii.7."

Ans. Does not occur either in Jeremiah or the earlier books.

(20.) "'מִשְׁלַח יָדִים, 'putting to of the hands' xii.7,18,xv.10, xxiii.20.xxviii.8,20,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*"

Ans. A sufficient answer. The passage referred to in Jeremiah as partially parallel, 'he put forth his hand' (i.9), may be easily balanced by exactly similar ones in the earlier Mosaic writings (see Gen.iii.22, viii.9,xxii.10,Ex.iv.4,&c.).

(21.) "'set (שִׁכֵּן) my name', xii.11,xiv.23,xvi.2,6,11,xxvi.2."

Ans. This is simply the ordinary verb for 'dwell' used throughout the Bible, and common in the earlier books. The name of the Tabernacle מִשְׁכָּן being derived from it, it would be sure to be used for the establishment of the sanctuary. It is found in Ex.xxv.8, xxix.45-6 of God's '*dwelling* in the midst of them', and in Lev.xvi.16, in the same way of the 'tent of the congregation' (all Mosaic). The exact phrase 'set my Name' does not however occur. It is found once in Jeremiah, with reference to the sanctuary at Shiloh (vii.12).

(22.) "'burn up (בָּעַר) the evil from the midst', xiii.5,xvii.7,12, xix.13,19,xxi.9,21,xxii.21,22,24.xxiv.7."

Ans. Already considered (p.166). The phrase does not occur either in Jeremiah * or the earlier books.

(23.) "דָּם נָקִי, 'innocent blood', xix.10,13,xxi.8,9,xxvii.25."

Ans. Not found together in the earlier books; 'innocent' alone occurs in Gen.xxiv.8,Ex.xx.7,xxxiv.7, (all Mosaic). Not uncommon in Jeremiah (vii.6,xxii.3,17,xxvi.15; comp. xix.4).

The conclusions arrived at by these inquiries may be summed up thus. Three out of the 23 are repetitions of previous instances, in the first of which (2) Jeremiah agrees with the Deuteronomist, and the earlier books differ from him; in the second (9) Jeremiah agrees partially, and the other books differ; in the third (22) they both differ. Of the 20 new instances, two find no parallel in either (16) (19); two are very slightly paralleled by both, in about equal degrees (6) (20); three are more fully paralleled, but still equally by both (3) (13) (14); two are unequally paralleled, but by neither fully, in one Jeremiah having the advantage (1), in the other the early Mosaic writings (11);—these, nine, then are clearly of no weight whatever. Of the remaining eleven, four are partially represented in the earlier books, fully in Jeremiah (10) (17) (21) (23); one is fully represented in the former, partially only in the latter (18); the other six are altogether absent from the earlier books, but present in Jeremiah, one partially (4), the rest fully (5) (7) (8) (12) (15). Or to express it more briefly, out of the whole 23, 12 are paralleled in the earlier Mosaic writings, viz. 1 fully, 7 partially, 4 slightly; 20 are paralleled in Jeremiah, viz. 10 fully, 7 partially, 3 slightly.

6. In addition to these, Bishop Colenso also adduces 12 '*other expressions, which occur three or four times in Deuteronomy, and nowhere else in the Pentateuch.*'

(1.) "עָרַץ, 'be terrified', i.29,vii.21,xx.3,xxxi.6."

---

* The authorship of 2 Kings is far too doubtful to render the occurrence of the word (not the full phrase) in xxiii.24 of any weight in our present controversy.

Ans. Not to be found in either the earlier books or Jeremiah. The latter, however, twice uses the adjective form עָרִיץ, 'terrible' (xv.21, xx.11).

(2.) "הִתְאַנַּף, 'be angry', i.37,iv.21,ix.8,20."

Ans. Does not occur either in Jeremiah or the earlier books.

(3.) "שָׁמַר מְאֹד, 'take good heed', ii.4,iv.9,15,xxiv.8."

Ans. The exact phrase does not occur in either Jeremiah or the earlier books. The verb שָׁמַר, 'take heed, or observe' is common to both. The adverb מְאֹד, 'very, diligently, much', also occurs constantly in the earlier books (see Gen.xiii.2,13,xxvii.33,34,xlvii.13, Ex.ix.3,18,24,x.14,xix.16,18 &c.), but more rarely in Jeremiah (ii.10, xviii.13,xlviii.16).

(4.) "'be strong and of good courage', iii.28,xxxi.6,7,23."

Ans. Does not occur in either Jeremiah or the earlier books. Three out of the four cases in Deuteronomy have regard to Joshua (comp. Josh.i.6,7,9,18,x.25).

(5.) "חֳלִי, 'sickness', vii.15,xxviii.59,61."

Ans. Not found in the earlier books; occurs twice in Jeremiah (vi.7,x.19).

(6.) "אַוַּת, 'longing', xii.15,20,21,xviii.6."

Ans. Not found in the earlier books; occurs once in Jeremiah (ii.24).

(7.) "'hear and fear' xiii.11,xvii.13,xix.20,xxi.21."

Ans. Already considered (p.162). Not found in either Jeremiah or the earlier books.

(8.) "'that shall be in those days', xvii.9,xix.17,xxvi.3."

Ans. Not found in either Jeremiah or the earlier books.

(9.) "'all that do these things', xviii.12,xxii.5,xxv.16."

Ans. The exact phrase does not occur in either Jeremiah or the earlier books. In the former we have, indeed, 'after she had done all these things' (iii.7); but comp. Gen.iii.14,xxii.16 &c.; and for parallelisms in sense Lev.xviii.24-30.

(10.) "חִלֵּל (lit. 'profane'), 'eat freely', xx.6,6,xxviii.30."

Ans. This word seems to have acquired its two-fold signification from the law of sacrifices, vows &c.; which, being given to the priests, the people were allowed at most to partake of but sparingly. Anything of which they 'ate freely' was therefore *common* or 'profane'. The word occurs in this sense three times in the earlier books. Lev.xix.8, 'Every one that *eateth* it shall bear his iniquity, because he hath *profaned* the holiness of Jehovah' (i.e., 'hath eaten as a common thing, that which was consecrated for sacrifice'). Lev.xxii. 15, 'They shall not *profane* the holy things of the children of Israel', the final injunction at the close of various laws as to *who might eat* of the offerings; and similarly Nu.xviii.32. The word occurs once with this reference in Jeremiah (xxxi.5).

(11.) "'forsake Jehovah, His Law, &c.' xxviii. 20, xxix. 25, xxxi.16."

Ans. Not met with in the earlier books, but very common in Jeremiah (i.16,ii.13,17,19,v.7,19,ix.13,xvi.11,11,xix.4,xxii.9). It is worth noting, that while in Deuteronomy 'forget' is the favourite expression, and 'forsake' occurs but seldom, in Jeremiah 'forsake' is much the commonest (see p.175).

(12.) "רָעוֹת, 'afflictions', xxxi.17,17,21,xxxii.23."

Ans. Does not occur in the earlier books, or the prophecy of Jeremiah; is found, however, once in Lamentations (iii.38).

We may sum up the results of our inquiries on these instances as follows. Of the 12 cases alleged, 4 are unrepresented in either Jeremiah or the earlier books (2) (4) (7) (8); one is fully represented in both (10). This leaves only 7 which can be of any weight in deciding the point at issue. Of these, 2 are partially paralleled in the earlier books, more slightly in Jeremiah (3) (9); one is absent from the former, and partially paralleled in the latter (1); the remaining 4 are absent from the earlier books, but present in Jeremiah (5) (6) (11) (12).

7. The next argument adduced by Bishop Colenso is the preponderance in Deuteronomy of such phrases as 'Jehovah *thy* God' &c. The case, according to him stands thus.—

The name Jehovah occurs in Deuteronomy in all 549 times, 307 of which are in such phrases as these. In the other four books it occurs 1279 times, yet are there only 60 instances of this kind.

Ans. Bishop Colenso himself admits, that 'considerable allowance must be made for the fact, that in Deuteronomy Moses is supposed to be speaking almost throughout, and therefore, such expressions as 'Jehovah thy God' &c., would naturally be used more frequently than in the other books.' He still thinks, however, that the difference of usage is 'very noticeable'; *why*, he does not say. Whatever it is worth, it at least cuts both ways; for on examining Jeremiah we find Jehovah in all 692 times, yet only 40 instances of the phrases in question; in Exodus and Leviticus there are 709 to 53.

8. Lastly, in order to shew that the phraseology of Deuteronomy is more *modern* than that of the other books, Bishop Colenso presents us with a list of '*expressions used by the Deuteronomist, and only by the later Biblical writers.*'

(1.) "סֶמֶל, 'image', Deut.iv.16,Ezek.viii.3,5,2Chron.xxxiii.7,15."

Ans. Does not occur in Jeremiah.

(2) "דִּבֶּר סָרָה עַל (אֶל) יְהוָה, 'to speak rebellion against Jehovah' Deut.xiii.6,Jer.xxviii.16,xxix.32, comp. *Is.*lix.13,—*nowhere else in the Bible.*"

Ans. The phrase is used of false prophets, who endeavoured to lead the people astray. If the law concerning them, and the punishment they were to receive (Deut.xiii.1-5), were in existence in the times of Jeremiah, nothing would be more natural than an allusion to its phraseology in his denunciations of Hananiah and Shelemiah, who had transgressed it.

(3.) "לְמַעַן 'for a removing', Deut.xxviii.25,Jer.xv.4,xxiv.9,xxix. 18,xxxiv.17,Ezek.xxiii.46,2Chron.xxix.8."

(4.) "שְׁרִירוּת לֵב 'stubbornness of heart,' Deut.xxix.18,Jer.iii.17, vii.24,ix.13,xi.8,xiii.10,xvi.12,xviii.12,xxiii.17,Ps.lxxxi.13 — *nowhere else in the Bible.*"

Ans. The frequent occurrence of these phrases, and especially the latter, in Jeremiah, which are found but *once* each in Deuteronomy, is certainly against the idea of common authorship. Psalm lxxxi. is referred by Bishop Colenso to Samuel (!), and was almost certainly written before the accession of David (see p.61); the phrase in question cannot therefore be, according to his own shewing, a *very* modern one.

(5.) "רָוָה, 'thirst', Deut.xxix.18,Jer.xxxi.12,*Is.*lviii.11."

(6.) "קָרַח, 'kindle', Deut. xxxii. 22, Jer. xv. 14, xvii. 4, *Is.* l. 11, lxiv.1."

Ans. But small evidence of late date, when the words occur so seldom. רָוָה does *not* mean 'thirst' but 'drunken' in Deut.xxix.18 (the word 'thirst' occurs in the same verse), or in the other two passages 'satisfied'.

(7.) "קְהִלָּה, 'assembly' Deut.xxxiii.4,Neh.v.7."

Ans. Merely another form of קָהָל (p.168-9). A non-mosaic part of Deuteronomy. Not in Jeremiah.

Of these seven instances of later words, then, two are wanting in Jeremiah (1) (7); one is at least as early as Samuel (4); one is readily explicable when taken in connection with the context (2); another is used in very diverse senses in Deuteronomy and the prophets (5); the remaining two (3) (6) are rather adverse to Jeremiah's authorship than favourable to it, as is still more strongly the case with one of those previously eliminated (4).

This is all the evidence which Bishop Colenso adduces in

behalf of his view of the authorship of Deuteronomy, so far as phraseology is concerned. We shall now proceed to sum up concisely what this evidence amounts to, omitting of course those points which our inquiries have shewn to be unsound or worthless. Hitherto we have carried on the two branches of our comparison simultaneously, that the true bearing of the evidence upon Bishop Colenso's theory might be made apparent; it being essential to his case, that the points of difference alleged between Deuteronomy and the earlier books, should also be points of agreement between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. At the present stage of our inquiries, however, it will be most convenient to consider these two branches separately; more especially as the disproof of Jeremiah's authorship of Deuteronomy by no means involves the proof of a common authorship for the latter and the earlier Mosaic writings. We shall first, therefore, consider the points of agreement or disagreement between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, already elucidated, or to be discovered on further investigation; and then, secondly, proceed to apply the same test to Deuteronomy and the earlier books. The only way in which the latter comparison will in any way influence the former, will be in causing the *exclusion* from the list of concordances between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, of all words, phrases, sentiments &c., which occur also in the first four books of the Pentateuch. That this is required by the nature of the case, apart from any assumption of common origin for the latter and Deuteronomy, may be easily shewn. These earlier books, it is admitted, were known both to Jeremiah and the author of Deuteronomy; from them both drew their information concerning the Exodus and the covenant in the wilderness. Cases of common agreement between all three, then, may fairly be ascribed to the influence of these earlier writings; and would be as likely to occur if the authors of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah were distinct, as if they were identical. Excluding these, we have the following cases of agreement between Deuteronomy

and Jeremiah, which may be urged as evidence of their common authorship.

1. Sentiments.
   (*a*) *heart* service required; Deut. 9 times; Jer. several times.
   (*b*) Jehovah had *chastened* Israel; Deut. twice; Jer. many times.
   (*c*) Jehovah to be *feared*; Deut. 4 times; Jer. several times.
   (*d*) Jehovah *loved* Israel; Deut 5 times; Jer. once.
   (*e*) *forgetting* Jehovah; Deut. 5 times; Jer. 5 times.
   (*f*) *forsaking* Jehovah; Deut. 3 times; Jer. 12 times.
2. Phrases.
   (*a*) '*give* before the face' (= 'set before'); Deut. 6 times; Jer. 5 times.
   (*b*) 'work of the hands' (= 'idols'); Deut. twice; Jer. 6 times.
   (*c*) 'which thou knewest not', &c.; Deut. 15 times; Jer. 10 times.
   (*d*) 'stranger, fatherless and widow'; Deut. 11 times; Jer. twice.
   (*e*) 'set my Name'; Deut. 6 times; Jer. once.
   (*f*) 'innocent blood'; Deut. 5 times; Jer. 4 times.
   (*g*) 'speak rebellion against Jehovah'; Deut. once; Jer. twice.
   (*h*) 'for a removing' (= 'fright'); Deut. once; Jer. 4 times.
   (*i*) 'stubborness of heart'; Deut. once; Jer. 8 times.
3. Words.
   (*a*) יְרֻשָּׁה 'possession'; Deut. 7 times; Jer. once.
   (*b*) לָמַד 'learn'; Deut. 12 times; Jer. 12 times.
   (*c*) נָדַח 'drive'; Deut. 10 times; Jer. 17 times.
   (*d*) כָּעַס 'provoke'; Deut. 8 times; Jer. 11 times.
   (*e*) חֳלִי 'sickness'; Deut. 3 times; Jer. twice.
   (*f*) אַוַּת 'longing'; Deut. 4 times; Jer. once.
   (*g*) רָעוֹת 'afflictions'; Deut. 4 times; Jer. once.
   (*h*) קָדַח 'kindle'; Deut. once; Jer. twice.

Many of these, it will be observed, are resemblances founded upon *single* passages of one or other author,—viz. 1. (*d*); 2. (*e*), (*g*), (*h*), (*i*); 3. (*a*), (*f*), (*g*), (*h*)—and so of little real value in determining the point at issue. Others are partially paralleled in the earlier books,—viz. 1. (*c*); 2. (*a*), (*d*), (*e*); 3. (*a*)—while others involve *differences* of even greater weight than the agreements, —viz. 2. (*a*), (*b*); and in a lesser degree 1. (*a*) also. If these be eliminated, it will leave but *three* sentiments, *one* phrase, and *four* words, on which the argument for common authorship really depends. But yet again, very many of these words and phrases are found also in *other* prophets, who wrote before

Jeremiah, shewing that they were common and well known at the time, and that consequently their occurrence in Deuteronomy is really no argument for Jeremiah's authorship whatever, since they were as likely to occur had Deuteronomy been written by some other writer instead.

1. (*b*) Jehovah *chastening* Israel, Hos.x.10.
   (*c*) Jehovah to be *feared*, Hos.iii.5,x.3.
   (*d*) Jehovah *loving* Israel, Hos.iii.1,ix.15,xi.1,4,xiv.4.
   (*e*) *forgetting* Jehovah, Hos.ii.13,iv.6,viii.14.
   (*f*) *forsaking* Jehovah, Is.i.4,28.
2. (*b*) 'work of the hands', Is.ii.8,xvii.8,Mic.v.12.
   (*d*) 'stranger, fatherless, widow' &c., Is.i.17,23,x.2.
   (*f*) 'innocent blood', Joel,iii.19.
3. (*b*) לִמֵּד 'learn', Is.i.17,ii.4,Mic.iv.3.

If these also be deducted, it will leave but *one* phrase, and *three* words in favour of the common authorship of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. Small ground for a decision indeed. Thus much, however, may readily be admitted:—the prophecies of Jeremiah present *more* points of agreement with Deuteronomy, both in sentiment and phraseology, than any other of the works composed during the monarchy (or afterwards), which have come down to us. Now, as Bishop Colenso very fairly and wisely argues, it is hardly possible that the author of so remarkable a book as Deuteronomy, if written during these times, should be one unknown to fame, should 'have disappeared completely from the stage of Jewish history, in an age when historical records were diligently kept, without leaving behind any other trace of his existence and activity'. But there is no other known writer of these times, who could have written it (judging by phraseology), except Jeremiah. The conclusion to be drawn from these two positions is manifest;—if Jeremiah did *not* write it, then it was *not* written in those times at all. Except, therefore, Bishop Colenso can produce cogent reasons for believing that Jeremiah *did* write it, he must, on his own principles, admit that the book did *not* originate in the later times of the Jewish monarchy at all.

We have examined the positive evidence adduced by him in support of his theory, and have seen how little it really amounts to. We shall now sum up in the same way the negative evidence deducible from his own arguments, the points of *discordance* between Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, tacitly admitted by himself, before we proceed to the investigation of fresh materials.

1. Sentiments.
   (*a*) the nations of Canaan *greater and mightier* than Israel; Deut. 4 times.
   (*b*) *forty years* sojourn in the wilderness; Deut. 3 times.
   (*c*) only *one* God; Deut. 4 times.
   (*d*) obedience to be blessed with *long life*; Deut. 12 times.
   (*e*) the *voice* of God speaking out of the *fire*; Deut. 12 timee.
   (*f*) the good things of Canaan would *corrupt* the people; Deut. 6 times.
   (*g*) the Canaanites would be driven out by *Jehovah*; Deut. 16 times.
   (*h*) the Canaanites to be *utterly destroyed* by Israel; Deut. 6 times.
   (*i*) the Canaanites would seduce Israel to idolatry; Deut. 3 times.
   (*k*) the effect of *example* in deterring from crime; Deut. 4 times.
2. Phrases.
   (*a*) 'thou shalt *put away* (lit. 'burn up') the evil from the midst of you'; Deut. 11 times.
   (*b*) 'remember that thou wast a servant in Egypt'; Deut. 5 times.
   (*c*) 'all the commandment' &c.; Deut. 10 times.
   (*d*) 'abomination unto Jehovah'; Deut. 8 times.
   (*e*) 'a blessing and a curse'; Deut. 3 times.
   (*f*) 'eat before Jehovah'; Deut. 6 times.
   (*g*) 'putting to of the hands'; Deut. 6 times.
   (*h*) 'take good heed'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*i*) 'be strong and of good courage'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*k*) 'hear and fear'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*l*) 'that shall be in those days'; Deut. 3 times.
   (*m*) 'all that do these things'; Deut. 3 times.
3. Words.
   (*a*) שֵׁבֶט 'tribe'; Deut. 18 times.
   (*b*) שׁוֹר 'bullock'; Deut. 12 times.
   (*c*) הֵיטֵב 'thoroughly'; Deut. 5 times.
   (*d*) יָרֵא 'be terrified'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*e*) הִתְאַנֵּף 'be angry'; Deut. 4 times.

We have here omitted several cases of only partial parallelism, and all instances of single occurrences; perhaps two of the

phrases—2. (*d*) (*h*)—might also be excepted as partially represented in Jeremiah. Still even thus, there remain *ten* sentiments, *ten* phrases, and *five* words, of frequent occurrence in Deuteronomy, but *not once to be found in Jeremiah*. Judged therefore, by Bishop Colenso's own evidence, the case is clearly against Jeremiah's authorship. The points of discord are more numerous than the points of agreement. Here then we might fairly leave the question; Bishop Colenso's theory being, as in other cases, sufficiently overthrown by his own arguments. But as it is a point of considerable interest and importance, and one moreover upon which he seems disposed to lay some stress, it may be well to carry the comparison a little further. We shall now, therefore, submit a list of additional discrepancies, over and above those just enumerated, still taking Deuteronomy as the standard of comparison.

(1). Jehovah is said to have '*borne* Israel as a father his son,' i.31, xxxiii.3* (comp.i.9,12,xxxiii.27); or in another place as an *eagle* her young, xxxii.11-2. The latter idea is also contained in Ex.xix. 4 (Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(2.) Fathers were to *teach their children* the law, the goodness of Jehovah, &c., iv.9,10,vi.7,20-5,xi.19 (comp.xxxi.13). The same is insisted on in the earlier books, Gen.xviii.19,Ex.xii.26-7,xiii.8-9,14-5 (all Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(3.) Among the plagues which should come upon them if disobedient, but should be withheld if obedient, are mentioned the *evil diseases of Egypt*, vii.15,xxviii.27,60. These are also spoken of in Ex.xv.26 (Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(4.) They were commanded not to *respect persons* in judgment &c., following therein the example of God, i.17,x.17,xvi.19; which is also laid down in Lev.xix.15; comp.Ex.xxiii.6-7 (both Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(5.) They were as 'the stars of heaven for multitude', i.10,x.22, xxviii.62; according to the original promise to Abraham &c., Gen. xv.5,xxii.17,xxvi.4,Ex.xxxii.13 (all Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(6.) Frequent allusions are made to *lending* and *borrowing*, as practices much in vogue among the people, xv.2,6,8,xxiii.19-20,xxiv.10-3; so much so, that to be obliged to borrow instead of lend is enume-

* So Benisch, 'he bare the people in his bosom'; 'he loved the people' De Wette, and E. V.

rated among the curses incident to disobedience, xxviii.12,44. Mentioned also in Ex.xxii.25-7 (Mosaic);—only once alluded to by Jeremiah, and then as a thing likely to occasion popular hatred, xv.10.

(7.) 'to the right or to the left', of departure from God's laws, v.32,xvii.11,20,xxviii.14 (comp.ii.27);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(8.) 'thy gates', used of their habitations generally, 19 times; occurs also in Ex.xx.10 (Mosaic), and *once* in Jeremiah (xiv.2).

(9.) אָרַךְ, 'prolong', iv.26,40,v.16,30,vi.2,xi.9,xvii.20,xxii.7,xxv.15, xxx.18,xxxii.47 (comp.xxx.20); also in Ex.xx.12 (Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(10.) אָרַשׂ, 'betroth', xx.7,xxii.23,25,27,28,xxviii.30; also Ex.xxii. 15 (Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(11.) תַּבְנִית, 'likeness, pattern', iv.16,17,17,18,18; also Ex.xxv.9, 9,40 (Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(12.) תְּמוּנָה, 'similitude', iv.12,15,23,25,v.8; also Ex.xx.4 (Mosaic); —*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(13.) רֹאשִׁים, 'heads' of tribes, &c. i.13,15,v.20,xxix.9;—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(14.) שֹׁטְרִים 'bailiffs, officers', i.15,xvi.18,xx.5,8,9,xxxi.28; also Ex.v.6,10,14,15,19 (Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(15.) שֹׁפְטִים, 'judges', i.16,xvi.18,xvii.9,12,xix.17,18,xxi.2,xxv.2; —*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(16.) תָּעַב, 'abhor', vii.26,xxiii.8,8;—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(17.) נָסָה, 'try, prove', vi.16,16,viii.2,16,xiii.4; also in Ex.xv.25, xvi.4,xvii.2,7,xx.17 (all Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(18.) חָרָה, 'glow', used as a *verb*, vi.15,vii.4,xi.17,xxix.26,xxxi.17; also in Gen.iv.5,6,xviii.30,32,xxx.2,xxxix.19,Ex.iv.14,xxxii.10,11 (all Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah;* though the substantive 'fierceness' occurs occasionally (iv.8,26,xii.13,xxx.24), as also in the Pentateuch (Ex.xi.8,xxxii.12,Deut.xiii.18,xxix.24).

(19.) הִשְׁמִיד, 'exterminate', occurs 26 times; also in Lev.xxvi.30, Nu.xxxiii.52 (both Mosaic);—*nowhere in Jeremiah.*

(20.) קָרַב, 'approach', i.22,ii.19,37,iv.11,v.20,24,xx.2,10,xxv.11,xxxi. 14; also Ex.xiv.20,xvi.9,Lev.xviii.6,xx.16,xxi.17,18,Nu.xviii.3,7 (all Mosaic);—occurs in the Hiphil form 'cause to approach' once in Jeremiah (xxx.21).

(21.) מָחָה, 'wipe out', used of *persons*, *names* &c. ix.14.xxv.6,19, xxix.19; also Gen.vi.7,vii.4,23,23,Ex.xvii.15,xxxii.32,33 (all Mosaic, see p.29);—nowhere in this sense in Jeremiah, used once of *sins* (xviii.23).

(22.) שָׁמַר, 'keep', used with a substantive, as 'keep my commandments' &c., 35 times; also in the earlier books (Mosaic portions) 14 times;—is never thus used of the divine laws &c. by Jeremiah; occurs once of the commandments of 'Jonadab the son of Rechab' (xxxv.18), and occasionally in other significations (iii.5,v.24,viii.7,xx.10).*

---

* The more usual construction of this verb is with an *infinitive*, 'observe to do' &c. This only makes the peculiarity of the Pentateuchal usage the greater.

These instances speak for themselves; they shew an amount of divergence between the phraseology of Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, which is surely irreconcileable with the idea of common authorship. And this divergence, be it remembered, is all on one side,—peculiarities in Deuteronomy not represented or very slightly represented in Jeremiah. Now there can be no question but that the vocabulary of the latter is by far the largest, both from the greater compass, and more especially from the more poetic character, of the composition. If then there be so many words and phrases peculiar to the smaller work with its limited vocabulary, how many more may we not expect to find peculiar to the larger with its more extended one. The following list will shew how fully this expectation is realized in fact.

(1.) 'thus saith Jehovah,' occurs in Jeremiah 169 times;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(2.) 'declaration (נְאֻם) of Jehovah,' 154 times;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(3.) 'hear ye the word of Jehovah,' ii.4,vii.2,x.1,xix.3,xxi.11,xxii.2, 29,xxix.20,xxxiv.4,xlii.15,xliv.24,26;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(4.) 'God of Israel', 47 times;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(5.) '*house* of Judah, Israel' &c., 30 times;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(6.) '*daughter* of Zion, Judah' &c., 19 times in the prophecies, and 13 times in Lamentations;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(7.) 'Jehovah of *Hosts*' (יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת), 'God of *Hosts*' &c., 76 times;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(8.) 'Jehovah liveth', used as an asseveration, or oath, iv.2,v.2,xii. 16,xvi.14,15,xxiii.7,8,xxxviii.16,xliv.26;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(9.) 'shepherd', used of rulers &c., ii.8,iii.15,vi.3,x.21,xii.10,xxiii. 1-4,xxv.34-6,xlix.19,l.6,44 *;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(10.) 'I am with thee to deliver thee', i.8,19,xv.20,xlii.11;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(11.) 'rising up early and sending, speaking, &c.', vii.13,25,xi.7,xxv. 3,4,xxvi.5,xxix:19,xxxii.33,xxxv.14,xliv.4;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(12.) 'amend your ways', vii.3,5,xviii.11,xxvi.13,xxxv.15;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

---

* Probably on account of Jeremiah's previous employment as a shepherd (xvii.16); allusions to sheep &c. are frequent in his prophecies (see xxxi.10,xliii.12 &c.)

(13.) 'return from your evil way' &c., xviii.11,xxvi.3,xxxv.15, xxxvi.3,7 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(14.) 'receive correction', ii.30,v.3,vii.28,xvii.23,xxxii.33,xxxv.13 ; —*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(15.) 'pronounce evil upon', xi.17,xix.15,xxvi.13,19,xxxv.17,xxxvi. 7,31,xl.2 ; comp.xviii.8 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(16.) 'without an inhabitant', ii.15,iv.7,vi.8,ix.11,xxvi.9,xxxiii.10, xxxiv.22,xliv.22,xlvi.19,li.29,37 ; comp.ii.6,xxxiii.12,xxxvi.29,xliv.2, xlviii.9,xlix.18,33,l.3,13,39,40,li.43,62 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(17.) 'a woman in travail' &c., this simile occurs 9 times (iv.31, vi.24,xiii.21,xxii.23,xxx.6,xlviii.41,xlix.22-24,l.43) ;—*not once in Deuteronomy.*

(18.) 'the voice of mirth, of rejoicing, of the bridegroom, of the bride' &c., vii.34,xvi.9,xxv.10,xxxiii.11 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(19.) 'shall be as dung upon the face of the ground' &c., viii.2,ix. 22,xvi.4,xxv.33 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(20.) 'every one that passeth by', xviii.16,xix.8,xxii.8,xlix.17,l.13, Lam.ii.15 ; comp.i.12 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(21.) 'none to bury' &c., viii.2,xvi.4,6,xxv.33 ; comp.ix.22 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(22.) 'man and *beast*' &c., ix.10,xii.4,xxi.6,xxxiii.10,xxxvi.29,l.3 ; —*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(23.) 'sword and famine and pestilence' &c., xv.2,xxiv.10,xxvii.8, 13,xxix.17,xxxii.24,36,xlii.22 ; comp. xliv. 12 ; — *nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(24.) 'burn that none can quench', iv.4,vii.20,xvii.27,xxi.12 ; comp.xvii.4 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(25.) 'burn incense unto &c.', 20 times ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(26.) 'prophesy lies', v.31,xiv.14,xx.6,xxiii.25,32,xxvii.10,15,16, xxix.9,21,31, comp.Lam.ii.14 ;—not in Deuteronomy, but comp. xviii.20.

(27.) 'bring evil upon' &c., 18 times ;—once only in Deuteronomy (xxix.27).

(28.) '*house* of Jehovah, that is called by my name' &c., 31 times ; —*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(29.) נָטַע, 'plant', used of *nations* &c. i.10,ii.21,xi.17,xii.2,xviii.9, xxiv.6,xxxii.41,xlv.4 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(30.) יָעַף, 'be weary', ii.24,iv.31,li.58,64 ; — *nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(31.) מָאַס, 'scorn, despise', ii.37,iv.30,vi.19,30,vii.29,viii.9,xiv.19, 19,xxxi.37,xxxiii.24 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(32.) מְשֻׁבָה, שׁוּבָה, 'backsliding', iii.6,8,11,12,14,22,xxxi.22,xlix. 4 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(33.) בָּגוֹד, 'treacherous', iii.7,10,11,20,20,v.11,11,ix.1,xii.1,1,6, Lam.i.2 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(34.) תַּחֲנוּנִים, 'supplications', iii.21,xxxi.9,xlii.2,9 ;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(35.) שָׁדַד, 'spoil', as verb, iv.13,20,20,xlvii.4,xlviii.1,15,20,xlix.3,

10,28,li.55; as substantive (שֹׁד 'spoil', or שֹׁדֵד 'spoiler'), vi.7,26, xx.8,xlviii.3,8,18,32,li.48,53,56; in all 21 times;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(36.) שַׁעֲרוּרָה, 'horrible', v.30,xviii.13,xxiii.14;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(37.) כָּשַׁל, 'stumble', vi.15,21,viii.12,xviii.15,xx.11,xxxi.9,xlvi.6, 12,16,Lam.i.14;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(38.) קִינָה, 'lamentation', vii.29,ix.9,19;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(39.) נָהִי, 'wailing', ix.9,17,18,19;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(40.) דָּמַם, 'be silent', vi.2,viii.14,14,l.30,li.6,Lam.iii.28;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(41.) נָתַךְ, 'pour out', vii.20,xlii.18,18,xliv.6;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(42.) נָצָה (Hiph. or Niph.), 'set on fire, kindle', ii.15,ix.9,11,xvii. 27,xxi.14,xxxii.29,xliii.12,xlix.2,27,l.32,li.58,Lam.iv.11.;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(43.) פָּשַׁע, 'transgress', ii.8,29,iii.13,xxxiii.8,Lam.iii.42;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(44.) חֶרְפָּה, 'disgrace, reproach' (subst.), xx.8,xiii.40,xxiv.9,xxxi. 19,xlii.18,xliv.8,12,xlix.13,li.51,Lam.iii.30,iii.61,v.1;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(45.) עָשָׂה כָּלָה, 'make a full end', iv.27,v.18,xxx.11,11,xlvi.28, 28;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(46.) בּוֹשׁ, 'be ashamed, confounded', 22 times;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(47.) שְׁרֵקָה, 'hissing', xviii.16,xix.8,xxv.9,18,xxix.18,li.37;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(48.) סַעַר, 'whirlwind', xxiii.19,19,xxx.23,23;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

(49.) שֶׁבֶר, 'breach', iv.20,20,vi.1,14,viii.11,21,x.19,xiv.17,xxx.12, 15,xlviii.3,5,li.54,Lam.ii.13;—*nowhere in Deuteronomy.*

We may surely apply to this array of evidence the words used by Bishop Colenso at the close of his comparison of Deuteronomy with the other books of the Pentateuch, merely substituting 'Jeremiah' for 'Moses'.

"The conclusion to be drawn from the above facts, in addition to what has been already produced of a similar character, appears to be irresistible. It seems *impossible* to believe that either *Jeremiah*, or any other writer, can have had his whole tone of thought and expression so changed . . . as would be necessary to account for the above phenomena,—unless, indeed, it be supposed that a special miracle was wrought for the express purpose of so modifying his language."

The evidence we have adduced is, however, very far from *all*

that might be urged. We might point out the more advanced *tone of thought* perceptible in Jeremiah; how he looks forward to a time, when the 'ark of the covenant' should cease to exist, neither 'come to mind, nor be remembered', but Jerusalem should be called the 'throne of Jehovah', and '*all nations* should be gathered there to worship (iii.16-7); when the covenant of Mount Sinai, repeated in the plains of Moab, should be *done away*, and there should be no need of laws, or teachers, but God's will should be written upon every heart, and 'all should know him from the least unto the greatest' (xxxi.31-4). How he viewed the relation of God to Israel, not merely as that of a King to his people, or a Father to his children, but as the nearer and dearer one of a *Husband to his wife*, and founded on this his bitterest denunciations of their idolatrous whoredoms (ii.2,20,25, 33,iii.1-9,14,20,xiii.27, &c. &c.). Ideas which we search for in vain in Deuteronomy.

Or we might dwell upon the difference of *style* between them, and contrast the calm, stately, well-ordered, methodical rhetoric of Deuteronomy, so clear and simple, yet so full of energy and life, grandly majestic yet without a tinge of pompousness, with the ever-varying strains of Jeremiah, full of abrupt transitions and dramatic construction, pathos mingling with declamation, tenderness with direst cursing, abounding in metaphor and vivid description, yet often losing power by elaboration.* We might draw the pictures of the two men from the characteristics of their writings. The one, with giant mind and eagle eye, master of himself, his subject and his audience; simple and unassuming in manner, yet full of earnestness and latent fire; throwing his whole energies into the one purpose then before him; accustomed to authority, yet not fond of it; full of zeal for God, and love

* These characteristics may be best perceived by a comparison of similar passages in the two authors. For this purpose Deut.xxviii., xxix.10-xxx.,xxxii. and Jer.ii.-iii.5,xxii.-iii.8,xxx.-i.,l.-li. will be found especially suitable.

for Israel; majestic, dignified. The other, sensitive and excitable, feeling in his own person all the woes of which he wrote; now burning with fiery indignation against his nation's sins, and the next moment weeping with bitter sorrow over their punishment; essentially a man of feeling, carried away by his subject to write the transcript of his own sensations; weak and despairing, cursing the day when he was born, even doubting at times the reality of the future blessings God revealed to him; worn with woe and suffering, the 'weeping prophet'. Differences like these are indeed more difficult to define than those of phraseology or sentiment, but they are quite as real, and on the whole more certain signs of authorship. We might dilate upon them, and illustrate and enforce them by quotations and references; but we refrain. Enough has been said, we trust, to convince everyone, that whoever did write Deuteronomy, it certainly was *not* Jeremiah, but a very different man indeed.

But our evidence goes further than this; for it shews, that if Jeremiah did not write Deuteronomy, it must have been written very considerably *before* his times. We have already alluded to Bishop Colenso's observation, that the author of Deuteronomy must have been a man of 'very prominent position in the age in which he lived', one whose name has surely come down to us in Jewish history; with the impossibility of ascribing the book to any other known later writer except Jeremiah; and the conclusion which therefore necessarily follows upon the disproof of his authorship. But there are other reasons, that will serve to establish the same conclusion, quite apart from this admission, which are worth considering for a moment.

Many of the peculiarities noticed above as characteristic of Jeremiah, and proofs that he could not have composed the book of Deuteronomy, apply equally to his contemporaries, and may thus be taken as characteristics of the *age*, rather than of the particular writer. Thus the expression '*house* of Israel, of Judah' &c. is common to Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah,

Obadiah, and Zephaniah; '*daughter* of Zion' &c. to Isaiah, Amos, Micah, and Zephaniah; 'Jehovah of *Hosts*' &c. to Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah, and Habakkuk; '*declaration* of Jehovah' to Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, and Zephaniah; 'thus saith Jehovah' &c. to Isaiah, Ezekiel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, and Nahum; and the same may be said of many of the particular words also. Nor is this all; the *tone of thought* in the prophets generally presents the same characteristics as in Jeremiah. Isaiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Micah, and Zephaniah all agree in speaking of a future time when *all nations* should serve Jehovah, and his Spirit should be poured out upon all the people. Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea all refer to Israel's *marriage* with Jehovah, and subsequent whoredoms. All the known writers of this period of Jewish history being thus agreed, it is certainly most improbable that a book which differs from them all in so many points should have been written by one of their contemporaries.

But again; though Jeremiah, we are convinced, did not write the book of Deuteronomy, it seems certain that he was intimately acquainted with its contents, had deeply read and studied it. This is clear from the very numerous quotations from it, and allusions to it, which are found in his prophecies. Let us take a few examples.

Jer.iii.1,8, the allusions to 'a man's sending away his wife', his 'returning unto her again' being defiling to the land, and the 'bill of divorce given unto her', are all taken from the law of divorce recorded in Deut.xxiv.1-4.

Jer.iv.4, 'Circumcise yourselves unto Jehovah, and remove the *foreskins of your heart*', is clearly taken from Deut.x.16.

Jer.v.15, 'Lo, I will *bring a nation upon you from far*, O house of Israel, is the declaration of Jehovah; it is a mighty nation, it is a nation from antiquity, a nation *whose language thou knowest not*, neither understandest what they say', is derived in great measure from Deut. xxviii.49.

Jer.vii.33, 'The *carcases* of this people *shall be food for the fowl of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray them away*,' is an almost verbatim quotation from Deut.xxviii.26.

Jer.ix.15, the oft recurring simile of 'wormwood and poisonous herb' (see viii.14,xxiii.15, also Amos,vi.12), seems to be derived from Deut. xxix.18.

Jer.xi.4, 'out of the land of Egypt, from the *iron furnace*' is taken from Deut.iv.20.

Jer.xix.9, 'I will cause them to *eat the flesh of their sons and of their daughters*, and they shall eat every one the flesh of his fellow *in the siege and straitness wherewith their enemies* that seek their lives *shall straiten them*', is a quotation from Deut.xxviii.53.

Jer.xxxii.21, 'And hast brought forth thy people Israel out of the land of Egypt *with signs, and with wonders, and with a strong hand, and with a stretched-out arm, and with great dread*', is clearly taken from Deut.iv.34.

Jer.xxxiv.9,14, the law of release of Hebrew servants after 7 years is quoted from Deut.xv.12.*

But if thus quoted and referred to by Jeremiah, it is clear that it must have been written *before* his days, and regarded by him as authentic, since he quotes the laws contained in it as part of the 'covenant' made by God with the people when they came 'forth out of the land of Egypt'.

We now proceed to the second and more important branch of our investigations,—the comparison of Deuteronomy with the earlier Mosaic writings. As remarked at starting, nothing but the most overwhelming internal evidence of later date could warrant us in ascribing the addresses recorded in Deuteronomy to any other author than Moses. Even a marked similarity of phraseology and style between them and the works of any of the later prophets could not, since purposed imitation might reasonably account for such a phenomenon. But, as we have shewn, instead of similarity, there is the most marked dissimi-

* It cannot but be noticed, that in making these quotations Jeremiah has often *altered* the original, most commonly by *enlarging* some of its expressions, thereby at the same time *weakening* their force and energy very considerably. Jer.v.15, and xix.9, are notable examples of this. No author would have thus treated his own work.

The explanation which this fact, of Jeremiah having studied Deuteronomy, affords for their partial similarity in phraseology, is too manifest to need comment.

larity, both in style, phraseology, and general tone. So far then as this branch of evidence is concerned, the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy is unimpeachable. It remains for us now to consider whether its testimony is reconcileable with the Mosaic authorship of those sections of the earlier books, which we saw reason to ascribe to the great Jewish lawgiver (p.150). Are the divergences of phraseology such as to necessitate the ascription of these latter to another author? Bishop Colenso says they are, and has produced a large number of peculiarities in proof of his assertion. These we have already fully discussed, so that all that will be necessary here is to sum up briefly the results then arrived at, of course omitting those instances whose validity has been disproved. Which these are, and why they are omitted, the reader can easily ascertain by comparing the present lists with those in the former part of the chapter.

I.—*Peculiarities observable in the earlier Mosaic writings.*

1. Sentiments,—none.
2. Phrases.
   (*a*) 'that soul shall be cut off' &c.; Exod. 5 times, Levit. and Num. 16 times.
   (*b*) 'plains of Moab'; Numbers twice (three others doubtfully Mosaic).
   (*c*) 'tent of the congregation'; constantly in Exod. Levit. and Num.
3. Words.
   (*a*) אֲחֻזָּה 'possession'; Leviticus and Numbers 23 times.
   (יְרֻשָּׁה 'possession'; Deut. 6 times, not in other books.)
   (*b*) מִשְׁכָּן 'tabernacle'; constantly in Exod. and Num., 4 times in Levit.
   (*c*) עֵדוּת 'testimony'; constantly in Exod. and Num., 3 times in Levit.
   (*d*) קָרְבָּן 'offering'; constantly in Leviticus and Numbers.

Of these, it will be observed, five—2. (*b*), (*c*), 3. (*b*), (*c*), (*d*)—are technical terms, whose absence from Deuteronomy is quite explicable, on account of subject-matter. This leaves but *two* peculiarities, one of which only refers to the later legislation, and

not to the book of Exodus—3. (*a*);—the other is peculiar, but has no equivalent expression in Deuteronomy—2. (*a*).

II.—PARTIAL *peculiarities in the earlier writings.*

1. Sentiments,—none.
2. Phrases.
   (*a*) 'a man, a man' (= 'every man, whoever'); 'a man' (same signification); the former is used in Exodus once, Levit. and Num. 12 times; the latter in Gen. twice, Exod. 11 times, Levit. and Num. 41 times; the *latter only* in Deut. 21 times.
   (*b*) 'the bone of this day' (= this self-same day); 'this day'; the former is used in Exodus twice, in Leviticus 5 times; the latter very commonly in both, and *exclusively* in Deuteronomy.
   (*c*) 'land of Canaan'; 7 times in Gen., once in Exod., 10 times in Levit. and Num.; spoken of by some periphrasis in Gen. 4 times, in Exod. 9 times, in Levit. and Num. 3 times, and *exclusively* in Deuteronomy.
3. Words.
   (*a*) מַטֶּה 'tribe'; שֵׁבֶט 'tribe'; the former occurs in Exod. 6 times, in Levit. and Num. 32 times; the latter in Exod. twice, and *exclusively* in Deuteronomy.
   (*b*) פַּר 'bullock'; שׁוֹר 'bullock'; the former occurs in Exod. 9 times, in Levit. and Num. about 50 times; the latter in Exod. 21 times, in Levit. and Num. 5 times, and *exclusively* in Deuteronomy.
   (*c*) עֵדָה 'congregation'; קָהָל 'assembly'; the former occurs in Exod. 15 times, in Levit. and Num. 14 times; the latter in Exod. twice, in Levit. and Num. 7 times, and *exclusively* in Deuteronomy.

Of these six, it will be observed, that in *four* the author of Deuteronomy merely selects the *favourite* word or phrase of the author of Exodus—2. (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), 3. (*b*). The difference between Deuteronomy and the later legislation is somewhat greater. In point of fact, then, the evidence of diverse authorship deducible from peculiarities in the earlier books (not explicable by the necessities of the case), amounts to just this.—As regards Exodus, *one* complete difference, and *two* partial ones; as regards Leviticus and Numbers, *three* complete differences and *three* partial ones. This certainly is not very safe ground to go upon in deciding for diverse authorship.

III.—*Peculiarities observable in Deuteronomy.*

1. Sentiments.
   (*a*) the nations of Canaan *greater and mightier* than Israel; Deut. 4 times.
   (*b*) *forty years* sojourn in the wilderness; Deut. 3 times.
   (*c*) only *one* God; Deut. 4 times.
   (*d*) the *good things* of Canaan would *corrupt* them; Deut. 6 times.
   (*e*) *heart worship* required; Deut. 9 times.
   (*f*) Jehovah had *chastened* Israel; Deut. twice.
   (*g*) Israel to *fear* Jehovah; Deut. 4 times.
   (*h*) Jehovah *loved* Israel; Deut. 5 times.
   (*i*) Israel to *cleave* to Jehovah; Deut. 5 times.
   (*k*) Israel would *forget* Jehovah; Deut. 5 times.
   (*l*) Israel would *forsake* Jehovah; Deut. 3 times.
2. Phrases.
   (*a*) 'go in to *possess*' &c.; Deut. 29 times.
   (*b*) 'remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt'; Deut. five times.
   (*c*) 'give before the face' (= 'deliver up'); Deut. 7 times.
   (*d*) 'work of the hands' (= 'labour'); Deut. 6 times.
   (*e*) 'abomination unto Jehovah'; Deut. 8 times.
   (*f*) 'which thou knewest not' &c.; Deut. 12 times.
   (*g*) 'the stranger the fatherless and the widow'; Deut. 11 times.
   (*h*) 'eat before Jehovah'; Deut. 6 times.
   (*i*) 'putting to of the hands' (= 'labour'); Deut. 6 times.
   (*k*) 'set my Name'; Deut. 6 times.
   (*l*) 'burn up the evil from the midst'; Deut. 11 times.
   (*m*) 'innocent blood'; Deut. 5 times.
   (*n*) 'take good heed'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*o*) 'be strong and of good courage'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*p*) 'hear and fear'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*q*) 'that shall be in those days'; Deut. 3 times.
   (*r*) 'all that do these things'; Deut. 3 times.
3. Words.
   (*a*) לָמַד, 'learn'; Deut. 13 times.
   (*b*) נָהַג, 'drive, force'; Deut. 10 times.
   (*c*) כָּעַס, 'provoke'; Deut. 8 times.
   (*d*) הֵיטֵב, 'thoroughly'; Deut. 5 times.
   (*e*) עָרַץ, 'be terrified'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*f*) הִתְאַנֵּף, 'be angry'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*g*) חֳלִי, 'sickness'; Deut. 3 times.
   (*h*) אַוַּת, 'longing'; Deut. 4 times.
   (*i*) רָעוֹת, 'afflictions'; Deut. 4 times.

Here is certainly a strong array of evidence; *eleven* senti-

ments, *seventeen* phrases, and *nine* words, more or less common in Deuteronomy, but not once to be found in the earlier books. Can the existence of such difference be reconciled with common authorship? As already remarked (introd. p.xiv.) the works of the same author may often vary very considerably in phraseology, on account of different subject-matter, time of writing, and other attendant circumstances. A mere mechanical comparison of words and phrases, without regard to these extraneous sources of difference, is therefore a most uncertain guide. To take a single example from modern times. Suppose any one were to compare in this way Macaulay's History of England, Lays of Ancient Rome, and Indian code of laws, would he not find them in sentiment, phrase and verbiage, hopelessly at variance? Might he not easily construct long lists of peculiarities, observable in each, but unknown to either of the others? Yet would this be admitted as an argument against common authorship? Would it not be instantly objected,—these three works are utterly diverse in subject-matter and general character, were written at different times, and for different purposes, and therefore cannot be expected to agree in phraseology. May not something of the same sort be the reason of the differences just enumerated between Deuteronomy and the earlier Mosaic writings? Let us examine the matter anew in this light.

1. The addresses recorded in Deuteronomy were delivered within a few weeks of the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan, and with special reference to that event. Instruction, encouragement and warning were needed then, which before would have been out of place. We have indeed occasional allusions to it, more especially in the communication of God to Moses, in the earlier books, but nothing so full as in Deuteronomy. It was to be *expected*, then, that sentiments and phrases in connection with Canaan should be found *here*, which have no parallel in the earlier laws and narrative. Israel needed to be reminded of the strength of their opponents, that they might trust only in

Jehovah for help; and Moses tells them the nations of Canaan are 'greater and mightier' than they. To have done so before would have only tended to discourage them; but now, on the eve of conquest, and flushed with their recent victories over Sihon and Og, and the princes of Midian, the warning was necessary—1. (*a*). They were passing suddenly out of a state of privation and hardship, a dreary and barren wilderness, into luxury and affluence; they needed warning on this score also, lest they should become corrupt. To have referred to this in the midst of their sufferings and want, and when many years of wandering were still before them, would have been very incongruous. In the plains of Moab, where the evil effects of such a change had been already painfully exhibited in the whoredoms with the daughters of Midian, it was most appropriate—1. (*d*). Hitherto the promised land had been a distant good, unseen and out of reach, it was in the possession of foreigners—the 'land of Canaan',—theirs only in the future, and by virtue of an oath made centuries before—the 'land which Jehovah had sworn unto their fathers' to give them. Now it was more than this, it was theirs in immediate prospect,—the 'land whither they were going over to possess it'; which it had never been before—2. (*a*). Their appearance in it was to strike terror among the inhabitants; it was 'given up before their face'. It had not been so heretofore, and so the phrase was never used—2. (*c*). Moses was about to resign his leadership, and his successor needed encouragement for the arduous task that was before him. Was there call for this, when as yet he was unchosen, and Moses fondly hoped to lead the people into Canaan himself—2. (*o*)? What need again to tell Joshua or Israel generally not to 'be terrified'—3. (*e*)—at the giant Anakim, in whose sight they would seem to be 'as grasshoppers', until about to be brought into contact with them? That the exhortation was needed *then* is very clear from the dismay which the mere report of their appearance and stature had spread among the people 38 years before (Nu.xiii.28,

32-3,xiv.1-4). Here, then, are *six* of the peculiarities fully accounted for.

2. Moses in these addresses takes a retrospect of their past history, such as could only be done at the end of their journeyings. He reminds them how many years Jehovah has cared for them, and led them, and provided them with all things necessary, as a pledge of similar kindness and blessing in the future—1. (*b*). He reminds them also of God's fatherly care over them in another way, as 'chastening' and 'instructing' them during the same period—1. (*f*). Until the 'forty years' were expired or almost expired, and their peculiar wants and trials at an end, such retrospects could not well be made. Here, then, are two more peculiarities explained.

3. Moses also spoke much of the *future*, and enacted many laws which had to do exclusively with the new state of things in Canaan. Hitherto the poor of the people—'the stranger and the fatherless and the widow',—had fared as well as the rich, for both were dependent upon the heaven-sent manna for daily food. But now the manna was about to cease; the rich and independent would take possession of the land, and these poor ones would be only too likely to be neglected and oppressed. It was needful, then, to remind the people of their new duties in respect of these, and shew them how and when they were to be performed—2. (*g*). During the sojourn in the wilderness the Tabernacle had no fixed dwelling-place, but wandered about with the people from station to station. Henceforth it was to be otherwise, there was to be one special 'place' where Jehovah would 'set his Name', whither all the people were to resort—2. (*k*). In the wilderness there had been no means of celebrating the various festivals, no first-fruits or tithes to offer. The bringing and eating of these, and other offerings, 'before Jehovah', was a *new* thing, for which therefore special instructions were needed; certainly more appropriate immediately before their entrance into Canaan, than at any other time—2. (*k*). Moses' words and laws

were not intended merely for the present, but for many generations, and long periods of time; the present leaders, priests and judges would die and pass away, but the laws were to remain. When Joshua and Eleazar and Phinehas were dead, the people might however imagine themselves at liberty to do as they pleased. Moses would teach them the contrary. He therefore lays stress upon the future, as well as present, bearing of his laws, by speaking every now and then expressly of the priests or judges, who 'should be in those days' yet to come—2. (*g*). The same prospective view of the fortunes of his people will also account for the frequent mention of new 'gods which neither they nor their fathers knew', and such like phrases; all of which (save two, which refer to the manna, and are therefore *retrospective* as in the preceding section) refer to the future—2. (*f*). Here are five more peculiarities accounted for.

4. The book of Deuteronomy consists in great part of fervid *exhortations* to obedience, and *warnings* against disobedience. These are found but seldom in the earlier books, which are composed almost entirely of simple narrative, and minutely special laws. It is admitted that such a change of method is reasonable and natural at such a time, and from such a man.*

---

* On this point, Bishop Colenso writes as follows (Pt.III.,p.394). —"But it may, perhaps, be asked, 'Was not Moses himself capable of producing such a book as this?' At the close of his long life, after so many awful communings with God, being now, as it were, in the very hour of his own dissolution, with his bodily eye, indeed, undimmed, and his natural force unabated, Deut.xxxiv.7, but with his feet already standing on the verge of the eternal world, and his spirit's eyesight straining into the darkness that lay before him, is it wonderful that he should have felt the prophetical impulse seize him mightily, at such a time, with a power unknown before, and that he should have thus poured forth his dying utterances, of mingled laudation and reproof, encouragement and warning, blessing and cursing, in strains of unwonted force and eloquence? May not Moses, too, like Jacob of old, Gen.xlix.1-27, have gathered up the manifold and wonderful experiences of his life in this last burst of grand, heart-stirring, oratory? No longer now occupied with the

It must also be admitted that such a change would of necessity involve a considerable alteration in sentiment, and phraseology. Many ideas highly appropriate to exhortations and warnings, could not reasonably find place in either history or laws. The *love* which Jehovah bore towards them—1. (*h*);—the need of *heart* worship in addition to outward service—1. (*e*);—the call to *fear* Jehovah—1. (*g*),—to *cleave* unto him—1. (*i*);—the warning not to *forget* him—1. (*k*),—to *forsake* him—1. (*l*),—or *provoke* him to anger—3. (*c*);—how natural, nay almost inevitable in such addresses as those of Moses; how utterly unlikely to occur in simple narrative or detailed laws. Seven at least of the peculiarities noted above, may thus be fairly explained as arising from this change of style and method.

5. It must be remembered that there was probably a lapse of several years between the composition of the book of Exodus, and of the principal laws in Leviticus and Numbers, and the delivery of the addresses recorded in Deuteronomy. A few of the laws in the book of Numbers belong indeed to the same

---

things of time,—the legends of hoar antiquity, the historical records of the events in the wilderness, the ritual of external worship, the requirements of the Camp and earthly Sanctuary,—may we not believe that he would wish to have his last hours occupied, as here, with the enforcement of eternal realities,—of that worship in spirit and in truth, of which these earthly things are but the symbols,—so as to leave lingering in the ears and in the hearts of his people the echo of those words which sum up the whole substance of his previous teaching,—'Hear, O Israel! Jehovah our God is One Jehovah; and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might,' Deut.vi.4,5,—words which One greater than Moses declared to contain the essence of all the Law and the Prophets, only adding to them the new command of the Gospel, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' Matt.xxii.37-39?"

Bishop Colenso, however, while admitting the 'plausibility' of such an argument, concludes that it cannot be accepted in explanation of the phenomena observed, because 1. the story of the Exodus is *unhistorical*; 2. the other books of the Pentateuch are *post-mosaic*; 3. the *language* and *subject-matter* of Deuteronomy differ equally with its *tone* and *spirit*. The first two of these reasons have been already set aside; the third (in part) is now under consideration.

date (xxviii.-xxx.,xxxiv.-vi.). But then these laws present scarcely any analogies in subject to Deuteronomy, and cannot fairly be compared with it. The narrative of the Exodus, with the Jehovistic sections in Genesis, and the bulk of the laws in Leviticus and Numbers, we may reasonably assume to have been written shortly after the departure from Kadesh-barnea; say within the first ten years of the wanderings. There may thus have been very likely a lapse of as much as 30 years between the completion of these, and the delivery of his parting addresses. How great a change might not this have occasioned in Moses' style, and choice of language? If the Epistles of Paul vary so much according to the time when they were written; if Luke's later history differs in some points so unaccountably from his earlier; why should not Moses' last words be allowed also to present a few divergences from his first, without his authorship being called in question? What alterations are to be ascribed to this source, it is of course impossible to say. We may however instance three of the peculiar phrases noted above, as having very likely originated in this way;—2. (*b*) 'remember that thou wast a servant in Egypt', a mere enlargement of the older expression 'house of servants'; 2. (*e*) 'abomination unto Jehovah', a more definite and emphatic form of the simple 'abomination' in common use before; and 2. (*n*) 'take good heed', a stronger equivalent of the previous 'take heed' or 'observe'. The influence of this element of change upon those differences of usage between Deuteronomy and the earlier books first considered (viz. peculiarities of the latter), must also not be overlooked.

Out of the thirty-seven peculiar sentiments, phrases, and words originally enumerated, there are thus twenty-three which are open to special explanation, while the remaining fourteen are no more than might be reasonably expected in a work so diverse in character from the earlier Mosaic writings, and composed after such an interval of time. Of course if the *whole* Pentateuch be

regarded as the immediate work of Moses, this last source of explanation is done away with; since then we must suppose the latter part of Numbers to have been written about the same time as Deuteronomy; whereby the number of divergences of usage is increased, while the grounds of explanation are diminished. It is thus that the difficulty is urged by Bishop Colenso. The very clear and convincing evidence already adduced (p.143-8) for the post-mosaic origin of the later narrative, however, renders the explanation we have urged above quite tenable.

There remains now but one other point to be considered, before we leave this part of our subject. Amidst all this difference, explicable or inexplicable, is there any countervailing *similarity* which may be used as an argument on the other side? Agreement in phraseology will here avail but little, since this might have arisen in many ways besides common authorship. It is a point, however, not to be overlooked, that in the greater number of the instances enumerated on p.185-6, in which Deuteronomy differs from Jeremiah, the usage of the former is identical with that of the earlier Mosaic writings;—Jehovah bearing Israel, Fathers teaching their children, the 'evil diseases of Egypt', no 'respect to persons', the 'stars of heaven for multitude', lending and borrowing, 'thy gates', 'prolong', 'betroth', 'likeness', 'similitude', 'try or prove', 'glow', 'exterminate', 'approach', 'wipe out', 'keep', all are common to Deuteronomy and the earlier books. A comparison of the *styles* of the two portions will, however, be a surer test of identity of authorship. For this purpose it is of course necessary to select passages of similar character and structure from each; say, if possible, two exhortations. These, as before remarked, are of rare occurrence in the earlier books, which are almost wholly occupied with narrative and laws. There is, however, one chapter, Lev.xxvi., which presents us with exactly what we need. It is in subject and general character almost identical with Deut. xxviii., except that here Jehovah himself is

represented as speaking, there Moses.* Two better test passages could not be selected.

Firstly, then, of the differences. Lev.xxvi. contains several words and phrases which are not found in Deuteronomy. We may notice especially the following.

מָאַס, 'scorn', *v.*15,—nowhere in Deuteronomy.
כָּשַׁל, 'stumble', *v.*37,—nowhere in Deuteronomy.
גָּעַל, 'loathe', *v.*11,15,43,44,—nowhere in Deuteronomy. †
מִשְׁכָּן, 'tabernacle', *v.*11,—nowhere in Deuteronomy.
מִקְדָּשׁ, 'sanctuary', *v.*2,31,—nowhere in Deuteronomy.
'walk contrary to', *v.*21,23,24,27,28,40,41,—nowhere in Deuteronomy.
'seven times more', *v.*18,21,24,28,—nowhere in Deuteronomy.

Besides which there are also several *ideas* not to be found in Deuteronomy, such as the extension of their *seasons* (*v.*5), the letting loose of *wild beasts* upon them (*v.*22), scarcity of *bread* (*v.*26), destruction of their *high-places* (*v.*30), the land enjoying her *sabbaths* (*v.*34-5,43), &c. There is also a certain difference in *style*; a gradual culmination of curses, as of so many successive chastisements to be resorted to in *order*, as each preceding one failed of its effect (see *v.*18,21,23-4,27-8), which has no parallel in Deuteronomy. To enumerate all the new ideas or phrases in Deut.xxviii. would take too long. A very large proportion of the peculiarities noted above (p.196) are represented in this chapter, which of course are altogether wanting in Leviticus, and there are also many others which might be mentioned. As, however, Deut.xxviii. is certainly the

---

* That this will not in any way affect the justice of the comparison is evident, if we bear in mind the way in which the *different* prophets convey the *words of God*, which invariably bear the impress of their *own* style as strongly as those which they speak in their own person. It is manifest from this, that the *words* and *style* and whole outward form of the message are in every case *theirs*, only the substance, the inner kernel of truth, being directly inspired.

† Nowhere else in the Pentateuch.

longer and more elaborate of the two, this is perhaps not to be wondered at.

But, secondly, of the agreement. This is very striking, the same ideas and words occurring continually in both;—the blessing of 'rain in its season' (Lev.xxvi.4,Deut.xxviii.12), the chasing away of their enemies (Lev.xxvi.7-8,Deut.xxviii.7), the curses of 'consumption and fever' (Lev.xxvi.16,Deut.xxviii.22), of sowing their seed in vain (Lev.xxvi.16,Deut.xxviii.33,38), being driven before their enemies (Lev.xxvi.17,Deut.xxviii.25), heaven iron and earth copper (Lev.xxvi.19, *reversed* in Deut. xxviii.23), land and trees blighted (Lev.xxvi.20,Deut.xxviii. 39-40), pestilence (Lev.xxvi.25, Deut.xxviii.21,27,35,60-1), being given into the hand of their enemies (Lev.xxvi.25,Deut. xxviii.48-52), having to 'eat the flesh of their sons and daughters' (Lev.xxvi.29, Deut.xxviii.53-7), being dispersed among the nations (Lev.xxvi.33,Deut.xxviii.64), faint-heartedness in their enemies' land (Lev.xxvi.36-9,Deut.xxviii.65-7), &c. The general style and tone of thought are also wonderfully like; energetic simplicity, methodical arrangement, majestic calmness, are the characteristics of both; neither can be paralleled except by the other. Yet is there no appearance of copying, or quotation; the same ideas appear in different form, order, and connection; each is perfectly harmonious and symmetrical, yet diverse in arrangement to the other. They are clearly the work of the *same author*, composed probably at a considerable interval of time, whence the divergences in phraseology.

But it is unnecessary to dwell upon the proofs of common authorship; Bishop Colenso admits that Lev.xxvi. is the work of the Deuteronomist, and regards it as an interpolation among the older composition. Here then is a common ground on which to stand. Lev.xxvi. is due to the same hand as Deuteronomy. And yet it does not contain *one* of those peculiar sentiments, phrases, or words, which are urged by Bishop

Colenso as conclusive proofs of the diverse authorship of the earlier books and Deuteronomy; contains, moreover, several which are altogether absent from the latter. Lev.xxvi. is exactly similar in subject-matter, style, and general tone, to some of the most characteristic sections of Deuteronomy. Yet, while Bishop Colenso says that 'it seems to him *impossible* without a *special miracle*', that Moses, or any other writer, could have so changed his style and phraseology within a short interval of time, as to have composed both Deuteronomy and the narratives and laws of the earlier books, he all the while finds no difficulty in believing—what is far more extraordinary and unaccountable, —that the Deuteronomist should have written Lev.xxvi., and yet have abstained from *all* his characteristic words and phrases, and employed several which he nowhere else makes use of, and this without any miracle at all. This is a most important admission. For if in that portion of the earlier books which most nearly resembles Deuteronomy in character and subject-matter, and where therefore agreement in phraseology might be most reasonably expected,—if in this it is admitted, that all the long array of differences of which so much is made, yet avail *nothing* against common authorship, we certainly need not trouble ourselves much about these same differences being observable also in regard to other sections, where agreement was *not* to be expected. However strongly these diversities of phraseology may militate against the common authorship of Deuteronomy and the earlier books generally (and Bishop Colenso says they render it *impossible* to believe in), they assuredly militate far more strongly against the common authorship of Deuteronomy and Lev.xxvi. But in this latter case we have Bishop Colenso's positive assurance that they avail nothing. Clearly then in the case of the books generally they must avail still less.

But there is yet another point of view in which this subject may be regarded. Lev.xxvi. is very closely connected with the

preceding chapter, and must clearly have come from the same hand. This is evidenced more especially by the mention of the *sabbaths of years* (nowhere directly referred to in Deuteronomy) when the land should rest from tillage (v.2,34-5,43), which was plainly suggested by the law concerning these sabbaths set forth in xxv.2-7,18-22; also by the parallelism between xxvi.13, and xxv.42,55. The admitted common authorship of Deuteronomy and Lev.xxvi., thus presents us with a powerful argument in favour of *all* the laws recorded in Leviticus being from the hand of Moses.

It now only remains to sum up in brief the conclusions to which our inquiries in this chapter have led us. They may be expressed in five propositions.

1. The enormous amount of difference in phraseology, style, and tone of thought, between the book of Deuteronomy and the prophecies of Jeremiah, render it utterly incredible that he could have written this concluding portion of the Pentateuch.

2. Similar differences in respect to the prophets generally, with other circumstances, shew that Deuteronomy must be of considerably *earlier* date.

3. The statements contained in the book itself are conclusive for its Mosaic character; though it is probable that the addresses contained in it were arranged, and the narrative portions added, by another and later hand.

4. The many differences in phraseology observable between Deuteronomy and those sections of the earlier books, which previous investigation led us to ascribe to Moses, are for the most part capable of special explanation, in respect of the time and circumstances when they were respectively written, the subjects treated of, method employed, and such like sources of divergence. The remainder being no more than might reasonably be expected to occur between works of the same author written at so considerable an interval of time.

5. The striking unity of style between Deuteronomy and such

portions of the earlier books as are, in structure and subject, sufficiently alike to be used for comparison, and the intimate connection between these latter and the books generally, furnishes a strong additional ground for believing their authors to be identical.

Many other incidental arguments to the same end will appear in the course of our further inquiries.*

---

* No allusion has been made in the text to the remarks of Bishop Colenso on the *integrity* of the book of Deuteronomy, which properly belong to this chapter. Many of these are merely defensive, by way of answer to Knobel's objections (those on xviii.1-4,xxii.1-24,xxiii. 1-8,16-26,xxiv.5-6,xxxi.16-30,xxxii.1-47,xxxiii.), and as such need no further comment. The only passages which Bishop Colenso himself assigns to another author than the Deuteronomist are iv.41-9 (all but *v.*45), xxxi.14-5,xxxii.48-52, and xxxiv.1-9 (both in part). These are all in narrative sections, and are therefore readily conceded to be from a different hand to the main substance of the book (see p.156-7). As examples of criticism they are, however, curious. The ascription of iv.45 to the Deuteronomist, on account of the "multiplication of synonymous terms, 'the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments'", and the peculiar word (עֵדָה) used for 'testimonies' (almost the same as that commonly used in the earlier books for the tables of stone, see p.169), while all the rest of the section is put down as 'older document';—The separation of xxxi.14-5 from their immediate context, on account of the mention in them of the 'tent of the congregation';—These are sufficiently remarkable specimens of Biblical criticism. But the acme of perfection is not reached until xxxii.48-52, and xxxiv.1-9, when the provoking occurrence of 'land of Moab' (xxxii.49,xxxiv.5,6), and one or two other (supposed) Deuteronomistic phrases, in the midst of a glorious array of (supposed) 'older document' words, calls once more for the *retouching hand* of the later writer! The value of such criticism has been already pointed out (Introd.p.xvi.-ii.).

CHAPTER VIII.

DEUTERONOMY,—DISCREPANCIES WITH PREVIOUS NARRATIVE AND LAWS.

(BISHOP COLENSO, PART III., CHAP. IV.-XIII. (IN PART).)

WE come now to the *subject-matter* of Deuteronomy, and have to examine into its agreement or disagreement with that of the earlier books. It is alleged by Bishop Colenso, that there are 'numerous *contradictions*' between the two records, 'such as would naturally be expected to arise . . . when a later writer was adding freely from his own mind, and from his own point of view, to writings of an older time, and was not careful to preserve strictly the unity of the different parts of the story'. These discrepancies are said to exist, in respect to both narrative and laws, under which two heads we shall now proceed to consider them.

SECTION I. DISCREPANCIES IN NARRATIVE.

Several of the most striking incidents in the sojourn in the wilderness are referred to by Moses in his parting addresses, especially in those recorded in the first ten chapters. Before comparing these, however, with the narratives of Exodus and Numbers, it will be well first of all to ascertain *in what way* they are referred to, that we may rightly estimate the value to be placed upon agreement or disagreement. The first portion of the Deuteronomistic narrative, chap. i.-iii., consists of a con-

secutive and well-ordered account of their journeyings, from the time of their leaving Horeb to the time then present, a continuation in fact of Moses' own history in Ex.iii.-xl., taking up the thread of the narrative precisely where he had left it. This is the only portion of Deuteronomy which can be properly called a narrative. There are, indeed, numerous allusions to their past history, and especially to the giving of the law, in the addresses immediately following; but they are scattered and disconnected, and were evidently not intended as formal history, but merely as illustrative references, or isolated facts on which pointed exhortations might be founded. An analysis of chap. iv.-x., will be the best way of shewing what we mean.

iv.1-2 introductory exhortation to observance of the commands in their integrity; *v.*3-4 *the plague because of Baal Peor;* *v.*5-9 the peculiar privileges of Israel; *v.*10-5 *the assembly of the people at Horeb and delivery of the ten commandments;* *v.*16-9 warnings against idolatry; *v.*20 Israel a chosen people from the land of Egypt; *v.*21-2 *the exclusion of Moses from the promised land;* *v.*23-31 further warnings against idolatry, the punishments with which it should be visited, and the efficacy of repentance; *v.*32-8 Israel's peculiar privileges, with special reference to the *giving of the law*, the deliverance from Egypt, and the conquest of Canaan; *v.*39-40 concluding exhortations on the benefits of obedience. [*v.*41-9 non-mosaic.]

v.1, introductory exhortation; *v.*2-31 *account of the giving of the law, with a repetition of the ten commandments, and the people's request to Moses to be their mediator;* *v.*32-3 exhortation to abide by these commandents; vi., summary of the law, with exhortations to teach their children, not to be seduced by the good things of Canaan, nor follow other gods, with an allusion to their *trying God at Massah* (*v.*16); vii.-viii.1 directions as to their conduct in the land of Canaan, and the consequences which should result from it, with numerous references to Egypt and the Exodus; viii.2-5 God's fatherly care over them *forty years in the wilderness;* *v.*6-20 further exhortations concerning Canaan, with another allusion to their *sojourn in the desert* (*v.*15-6); ix.1-6 the land given them by God, but not for their righteousness; *v.*7 general statement of their rebellion in the wilderness; *v.*8-21 their rebellion in the matter of *the golden calf;* *v.*22 their rebellion at *Taberah, Massah, and Kibroth-Hattaavah*, *v.*23 their rebellion at *Kadesh-Barnea;* *v.*24 another general statement of their rebellion; *v.*25-9 resumed account of *the golden calf* and *Moses' intercession on behalf of the people;* x.1-5 *the making of two new tables of stone;*

[*v.*6-8 non-mosaic]; *v.*9 ***the separation of the tribe of Levi;*** *v.*10-1 conclusion of ***Moses' intercession and its results;*** *v.*12-22 general exhortations.

It is plain, that Moses, in referring to these incidents in their past history, had no intention of forming them into a regular narrative. It needs not to compare his allusions with any other history to perceive the utter disregard of chronology which characterizes them, his own orderly narrative of the events of the last 39 years, immediately preceding, is quite sufficient to convict him on this point. To suppose that he really meant to place the rebellions at Massah, or Kibroth-Hattaavah, or Kadesh-Barnea, in the midst of the history of the golden calf is absurd. Yet is this as clearly implied (if order of mention be regarded as indicative of order of occurrence), as the making of the ark before his second ascent into the mount, on which Bishop Colenso lays such stress. To treat these incidental references, then, as formal history is contrary to all just principles of reasoning, since it is clear that the author of Deuteronomy never intended them to be regarded in that light. So far as the *facts* alluded to are concerned the comparison may fairly be made, but divergences from the true *order* of events cannot be regarded as any proof of non-veracity, or lack of acquaintance with the true state of the case. Thus much premised, we proceed to the detailed discussion of the discrepancies alleged.

1. In the account of the events immediately subsequent to the giving of the law,—the sin of the golden calf &c.,—there are several important variations between the narratives of Deuteronomy and Exodus. Thus (*a*) there is no mention in Exodus of Moses fasting during the first forty days, Deut.ix.9; (*b*) there is no mention in Deuteronomy of Moses' first intercession on behalf of the people, Ex.xxxii.11-3; (*c*) Exodus says that Moses fasted during the second forty days, xxxiv.28, Deuteronomy that he 'fell down *as at the first*', ix.18,25; (*d*) Exodus represents the command to hew two fresh tables of stone as given *before* the second forty days, xxxiv.1,28, Deuteronomy *after* it, x.1; (*e*) there is no mention in Exodus of Jehovah's anger against Aaron, and Moses' intercession for him, Deut.ix.20; (*f*) Exodus places the making of the ark *after* the final descent from

the Mount, xxxiv.29,xxxv.10-12,xxxvii.1-5, Deuteronomy *before* the carrying up of the two tables, x.1,3,5.

Three out of these six alleged variations (*a*) (*b*) (*e*) are merely cases of *omission*, on the part of one narrative, of points mentioned in the other, which merely serve to show their independence, and so confirm the general truthfulness of both. One of them, moreover, is after all only a partial omission, since there can be little doubt but that the expression 'I threw myself before Jehovah *as at the first*, forty days and nights (I did neither eat bread nor drink water) because of all your sins', &c., refers to the previous intercession.* The words of intercession recorded in ix.26-9 are also clearly a summary of what Moses had said on both occasions (comp.Ex.xxxiii.11-3,xxxiv.9). One of the other objections (*c*) is founded on a partial quotation, it being clearly set forth in Exodus, as well as in Deuteronomy, that Moses *did* intercede for the people during his second stay in the Mount (Ex.xxxiv.9). The remaining two are questions of *order*, and as such have been already disposed of by the general remarks above. Similar variations will be found in the very parallel case of the history of St. Paul's conversion, as recorded by Luke (probably under his direction) in Acts,ix.1-20, and as recounted by himself on two different occasions (Acts,xxii.1-16 and xxvi.1-20). In the case now before us they furnish a very strong presumption that the author of Deuteronomy was

* The punctuation here followed is that of De Wette, which seems to bring out the sense most clearly. E. V. and Benisch read 'before Jehovah as at the first, forty days and forty nights; I did neither eat bread &c.' The other passage cited by Bishop Colenso as containing this phrase 'at the first' (on which he appears to wish to lay some stress, though for what purpose it is difficult to see) does not contain it at all. Literally translated, it runs as follows, 'And I threw myself before Jehovah *the* forty days and *the* forty nights *which I had thrown myself*' (ix.25), *i.e.* 'the *same* forty days and nights of which I spoke just now as having thrown myself' (comp.*v.*18). And so De Wette and Benisch. The words 'at the first' are inserted in E. V. in *italics;* Bishop Colenso quotes them as part of the text.

speaking of these events, not from book knowledge (in which case he would surely have endeavoured to be as consistent with older authorities as possible), but from personal acquaintance. How it came about that *Jeremiah* should have 'allowed himself such important variations from the older narratives', Bishop Colenso does not tell us.

2. The account of the appointment of officers in Deut.i.6-18 involves several inconsistencies with the earlier history. Thus (*a*) Ex.xviii.25-6 places it *before* the giving of the law, here it is placed just before their departure from Horeb, or nearly twelve months later; (*b*) both accounts differ from Nu.xi.14-7, which speaks of the appointment of helps to Moses as occurring *after they had left Horeb;* (*c*) in Ex.xviii.25 it is said that *Moses* chose them, in Deut.i.13 that they were merely brought to him to confirm their appointment; (*d*) in Ex.xviii.21, they are said to be 'such as feared God, men of truth, hating covetousness', in Nu.xi.17,29 those on whom 'Jehovah put His Spirit', in Deut.i.13,15 'wise men and known'.

This difficulty has been in great part already considered and removed. When discussing the origin of Ex.xviii. we saw strong internal reasons (apart from the evidence of Deuteronomy) for regarding it as out of chronological position, and the events it narrates as having taken place towards the *end* of the sojourn at Horeb, not at the beginning (see p.132-3). What authority Bishop Colenso has for supposing the account of the *seventy* elders who prophesied (Nu.xi.), to refer to the same event as the appointment of 'officers over thousands (some 600), and officers over hundreds (some 6,000), and officers over fifties (some 12,000), and officers over tens (some 60,000)', we are at a loss to imagine. Nor yet how this 'multitude of officers', who were appointed for the maintenance of law and order among the people, could in any way alleviate Moses' responsibility as *leader* of the people, of which he complained in Nu.xi.11-5.* The other

* The mention of 'bailiffs' in Nu.xi.16 shews clearly that their appointment was prior to the encampment at Kibroth-Hattaavah, the first great resting-place after leaving Horeb.

two objections (*c*) (*d*) are almost too trivial to be noticed; the selection of candidates for office by the leaders of the people did not surely preclude the exercise of *choice* on the part of Moses; nor their being 'God-fearing, truthful, and disinterested' present any obstacle to their being also 'wise, understanding, and known among their tribes'. It was only to be expected that in two independent narratives, proceeding from very different authors, there should be some variations in the way of stating such details.

3. In Nu.xi.3,35, Taberah and Kibroth-Hattaavah appear to be different names of one and the same encampment (comp.Nu.x.33,xi.3, with xxxiii.16); the Deuteronomist, ix.22, seems to regard them as different places.

The evidence for identity simply consists in the fact, that while the narrative of Numbers makes mention of *both* places, and of the plagues which fell upon the Israelites for their murmurings at each (whence the two names), the list of encampments in chap.xxxiii. only makes mention of Kibroth-Hattaavah. Since however we are expressly told that they had to journey *three days* from Horeb before they came to a resting-place (x.33), it is clear that there must have been *two halts* before they reached Kibroth-Hattaavah.* One of these, doubtless, was Taberah. There is nothing in the narrative concerning the two places to lead us to regard them as identical, but quite the contrary. It is most improbable that two significant names of this kind should have been given to the same place.

4. The account of the sending of the spies in Deut.i.21-3 differs from that in Nu.xiii., in two respects; (*a*) according to Deuteronomy they were sent at the suggestion of the people (i.22-3), according to Numbers at the command of God (xiii.1-2); (*b*) there is no mention in Numbers of Moses exhorting the people to 'go up and possess the land' *before* sending the spies, Deut.i.21.

---

* For further information respecting these halts and encampments, and the distinction between them, see Hist. Charact. Pent. p.81-2.

Here again we must bear in mind that we have two entirely independent accounts by two different authors; some variation in details is therefore not to be wondered at. The twofold origin of the spies' mission certainly involves no contradiction, since, as Scott and Hävernick very truly remark, the suggestion may well have proceeded from the people, but not been carried out until approved and commanded by God. The narrative in Numbers starts with this latter point. How the omission of the preceding details implies that Moses did not call upon the people to 'go up and possess the land' before this, it is hard to see. One might as well argue that because the Deuteronomist does not mention the princes' *names*, he 'implies' that they had none.

5. In Deut.x.6-7 certain journeyings of the children of Israel are recorded, which are directly at variance with those enumerated in Nu.xxxiii.31-5 in many respects. (*a*) The stations are named, partly in reverse order, partly in direct. Deut.—Beeroth of Bene-jaakan, Mosera, Gudgodah, Jotbath. Num.—Moseroth, Bene-jaakan, Hor-hagidgad, Jotbathah; (*b*) Aaron is said to have died at Mosera, Deut. x.6, while according to Numbers he died at Mount Hor, six stations further on, Nu.xxxiii.39.

This passage has already been considered at some length.* It is certainly an interpolation, as is evidenced, (1) by its utter want of connection with the context, (2) by the change of *person* observable in it, (3) the manifest sequence of *v.*8 upon *v.*5; to which we may further add, (4) the different spelling of each of the four names from that adopted by Moses in Nu.xxxiii., which would seem to imply that it came from another author. Our judgment upon its contents will not therefore in any way affect the character or veracity of Deuteronomy itself. The contradictions noticed are not however so hopelessly inexplicable as might at first sight appear. 'Beeroth' (='the wells') may have been a special place in the district of the children of Jaakan, visited in the march towards Mosera, but only as a *halting place*,

* Hist. Charact. Pent. p.2-3 note.

and therefore omitted in the list of *encampments* in Nu.xxxiii.; the *district* generally being subsequently revisited for a longer time.* The notice concerning the death of Aaron, in Deut.x.6, may perhaps be only parenthetical, as implying that Mosera was the station under Mount Hor, from whence Aaron ascended the hill, not that this took place at the particular visit here recorded. The whole passage and its occurrence in this place are, however, so perplexing, that we must be content to leave its agreement or disagreement with other portions of the Pentateuch a doubtful point.

6. The exclusion of Moses from the promised land is spoken of in Deut.i.37, as if it had been pronounced at the same time with the general sentence upon the people, after the return of the spies. Also in Deut.iv.21, it is said that Jehovah *swore* that he should not go in, a point unnoticed in Nu.xx.

The last of these objections is again one of those trifling divergences, involving no contradiction, but clearly shewing the independence of the two statements. We may be thankful that such exist to strengthen our arguments for the veracity of the narrative, by proving that we have *two* witnesses instead of one. With respect to the other, it is merely a matter of order, and no more implies that Moses meant to date his exclusion at the time of the spies' return, than that he meant to place Taberah, Massah and Kibroth-Hattaavah under Mount Sinai, when he introduces their names in ix.22. The truth is, that just as there the mention of Israel's rebellion in making the golden calf *suggested* the mention of other rebellions both before and after, so here the mention of the people's exclusion naturally suggested *his own*.

7. It is stated in Deut.ii.29 that the Edomites and Moabites sold

---

* We have no clue to the geographical position of either Beeroth, or Jaakan, and cannot therefore decide whether this would be possible or not. The Samaritan Pentateuch places these two stations in the same order as in Numbers. It may however have been corrected, so as to avoid the difficulty.

food and water to the Israelites, yet in Nu.xx.18,20,21,Jud.xi.17 it is said that both Edom and Moab *refused* to do so; also in Deut.xxiii. 3,4, the Ammonites and Moabites are ordered to be excluded from the congregation of Jehovah, because they met not Israel 'with bread and water in the way'. So again there is no mention in Numbers of Israel's being *forbidden* to attack Edom or Moab, Deut.ii.5,9, but that Israel could not go through Edom because they came out against them with a strong hand, Nu.xx.18,20-1; in Deuteronomy it is said that Edom should 'be afraid' (ii.4).

Whatever the first of these contradictions is worth, it at least applies as strongly to Deuteronomy itself, as to the other narrative; as an argument for diverse date or origin, therefore, it is worthless. But, in truth, the difficulties are fully disposed of in the explanations quoted by Bishop Colenso from Kurtz and Hengstenberg. The request recorded in Nu.xx. was made at Kadesh, and was for the right of passage through the Edomite territory; the buying of bread and water being merely a condition proposed to shew the king of Edom that they had no intention of committing depredations. It was refused with threats of resistance, and in consequence the people had to descend the valley of Arabah, and passing by Elath, reascend on the eastern side of Mount Seir. They were thus brought to the weaker side of the Edomite territory, part of which, it would seem, they passed through, scrupulously paying for all that they needed. In the same way they passed through part of the land of Moab, their king also having previously refused them a passage direct through the mountains (Jud.xi.17). Both Edom and Moab were naturally 'afraid' when they beheld the vast array of the Israelites on their least defensible frontier (Deut.ii.4), and sullenly allowed them to pass. Individual subjects of both kingdoms, however, supplied Israel with what necessaries they wanted, viz., the Edomites of *Seir*, and the Moabites of *Ar* (Deut.ii.29); but as nations they still kept aloof. Of this journey of the Israelites the narrative in Numbers tells us nothing, except the names of their encampments (xxi.10-20,xxxiii.41-7). The not meeting

Israel 'with bread and water in the way' spoken of in Deut. xxiii.3,4, unquestionably refers to their neglect of the duties of hospitality and relationship during the whole sojourn of Israel in their neighbourhood, and more especially to their refusal to let him pass through their territory until they found that resistance was hopeless.

These are all the discrepancies which Bishop Colenso alleges to exist between the narrative of Deuteronomy and that of the earlier books. We have seen that in no case do they involve the slightest contradiction in respect to the *events* spoken of, but rather, by furnishing us with proofs of the perfect independence of the two records, tend to establish the truthfulness of their statements more strongly than before. The only point in which they are really at variance is the chronological order of certain details, which is explained by the fact, that Moses in these addresses was not narrating a history but illustrating an exhortation, and therefore habitually disregarded chronology in his references to the past. The remaining objections to the narrative of Deuteronomy do not pretend to involve contradictions, and are really almost too trivial to be worth mentioning. For the sake of completeness, however, it may be well to consider them briefly, before passing on to more important matter.

8. The way in which 37 years of the sojourn in the wilderness is summed up in Deuteronomy,—'So ye abode in Kadesh many days, according unto the days that ye abode there' (i.46)—is very strange.

Ans. This is *not* all that is said about the period; the following verse,—'Then we turned, and journeyed into the desert by the way of the Red Sea, . . . and we compassed Mount Seir many days', (ii.1)—unquestionably refers to the same part of their history*. Why these 37 odd years are thus left almost blank, both here and in the larger narrative, it is impossible to say. We do not know what happened in them, and so cannot tell whether there was anything worth recording or not.

9. The miraculous supplies of clothing &c. spoken of in Deut.viii.4,

* See Hist. Charact. Pent. p.122-3.

xxix.5, are unmentioned in the other books, and present many difficulties.

Ans. Many commentators (*e.g.* Kurtz, quoted at length by Bishop Colenso,) believe that it was not a miraculous provision which is here referred to, but merely a providential supply of their wants. This view depends of course on the practicability of the Israelites obtaining garments, either by home manufacture or purchase. The grounds for believing that they could do so are ably set forth by Benisch (Critical examination of Bishop Colenso's Objections, Pt. I. p. 46-8). There is certainly nothing in the text to warrant us in supposing a miracle, if ordinary means of supply were sufficient. Silence is no proof of ignorance.

10. In Deut.xi.6 mention is made of the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram, but none of the true leader of their conspiracy, Korah.

Ans. In the passage in question Moses is recounting some of the mighty acts of Jehovah which they had witnessed since the Exodus, and among these instances the swallowing up of Dathan and Abiram, 'their houses, their tents and all their substance'. By omitting Korah's name he shews his minute acquaintance with the real facts of the case, for though Korah himself appears to have perished with Dathan and Abiram, yet his 'houses', 'tents' and 'substance' were certainly not swallowed up, since they were in a different part of the camp*, and moreover we are expressly told, that 'the children of Korah died not' (Nu.xxvi.11.). The omission therefore, so far from furnishing any argument for the non-veracity or later date of Deuteronomy, proves that its author was one intimately acquainted with the events he was speaking of. The special judgment on the 250 men was doubtless left out, as not having made so strong an impression upon the popular mind as the earth opening her mouth (comp.Nu.xvi.28-35).

11. The statement in Deut.xxxi.2 'I am an hundred and twenty years old this day, *I can no more go out and come in*', does not agree with xxxiv.7. 'Moses was an hundred and twenty years old when he died; *his eye was not dim nor his natural force abated*'. The former is due to the Deuteronomist, the latter to an older history from which he occasionally borrowed.

Ans. It is quite true that these two expressions come from different sources, the one being due to Moses himself, the other to the compiler of his speeches. That they contradict each other is by no means so plain. The 'going out and coming in' referred to was doubtless the leadership of the people, which he was about to lay down, as is said in the latter clause of the verse 'Jehovah hath said unto me, Thou shalt not pass over this Jordan'. How it can be possibly strained to mean clearness of eyesight, or energy of mind, we really cannot divine.†

---

* See Hist. Charact. Pent. p.180, § 10.

† There is one other contradiction referred to by Bishop Colenso, which may also perhaps be best noticed here.

In Deut.ix.3 it is said concerning the Canaanites 'thou shalt drive

SECTION II. DISCREPANCIES IN LAWS.

We have in Deuteronomy, besides the narrative in continuation of Exodus, and the numerous exhortations to obedience, several chapters of laws (xii.-xxvi.), delivered also by word of mouth, and intended for the special guidance of the people in the land of Canaan. Many of these refer to subjects already treated of in the laws delivered at Mount Sinai, or during their subsequent wanderings. There is also a repetition at length of the ten commandments, in Deut.v. It is asserted, 1. that these laws contained in Deuteronomy are in many important and vital points in direct contradiction to those recorded in the earlier books; and 2. that the difference is such, as can only be accounted for by supposing Deuteronomy to have been written at a considerably later period; while many of them point clearly to the last stages of the Hebrew monarchy as the time when they were enacted. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that *some* difference between these two collections of laws was to be expected, on account of the very different circumstances in which the Israelites were about to be placed. Supposing, that is,—which we have at present no reason to doubt,—that the earlier laws were delivered, as they themselves assert, in the wilderness, chiefly during the first two years of the sojourn there, and the later ones immediately before the entrance into Canaan. The course to be pursued will be, therefore, *first* to ascertain precisely what difference really exists, and then *secondly* to see by what

---

them out, and destroy them *quickly*, as Jehovah hath *said* unto thee'; only two chapters before this destroying them *quickly* was forbidden (vii.22).

Ans. A reference to the remarks already made as to the size of the land of Canaan (Hist. Charact. Pent. p.162-7), will set the difficulty at rest in an instant. The nations whom they were *not* to destroy quickly, were those in the *whole* land of their inheritance; those whom they *were* to destroy quickly were the Canaanites, of whose land they were at once to take possession (comp.Ex.xxiii.27-31).

means such difference may be most reasonably explained, whether by ascribing the later laws to Moses at the close of his life, or to some unknown writer living at some unknown period in much later times. That they were written by Jeremiah we have already shewn to be incredible.

1. In the version of the ten commandments contained in Deut.v. 6-21, there are numerous variations from the earlier record in Ex.xx. 2-17, in the fourth commandment especially, an entirely different reason being given for its observance in Deuteronomy to that set forth in Exodus. Yet both profess to state the identical words spoken by Jehovah from the top of Sinai. Moses clearly cannot have written both versions; and the author of the later one cannot have regarded the former as so very sacred or Divine, or he would not have ventured thus to alter it.

The differences existing between these two versions of the decalogue may be summed up as follows.—

(i.) Differences of *spelling*;—Ex.xx.5 has אָבֹת 'fathers', Deut.v.9 has אֲבוֹת*; Ex.xx.12 has יַאֲרִכוּן 'may be long', Deut.v.16 has יַאֲרִיכֻן.

(ii.) Insertions or omissions of וְ, 'and';—Ex.xx.4 inserts it before כָּל 'all', Deut.v.8 omits it; Deut.v.9 inserts it before עַל, 'unto', *v.*14 before עַבְדְּךָ 'manservant', *v.*17 three times, and *v.*18 twice, before לֹא 'not', Ex.xx.5,10,13,14 omit it.†

(iii.) Synonymous words;—Ex.xx.8 has זָכוֹר, 'remember', Deut.v. 12 has שָׁמוֹר 'observe'; Ex.xx.13 has שֶׁקֶר 'falsehood', Deut.v.17 has שָׁוְא (same meaning); Ex.xx.14 has תַּחְמֹד 'covet', Deut.v.18 has תִּתְאַוֶּה 'desire'.

(iv.) Change of order;—Ex.xx.17 puts 'house' before 'wife' in the tenth commandment, Deut.v.21 reverses them.

(v.) Clauses peculiar to Deuteronomy;—*v.*12,16 insert 'as Jehovah thy God commanded thee', in the fourth and fifth commandments; *v.*14 inserts 'and thine ox, and thine ass and all,' in the fourth commandment; *v.*16 inserts 'and that it may be well with thee', in the fifth commandment; *v.*21 inserts 'his field', in the tenth commandment.

(vi.) Alteration of clauses;—Ex.xx.11 reads 'For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and

---

* The 'older form' (!) vide Bishop Colenso Part II. p.293,298 (and comp. above p.86-7).

† In several of these instances there is considerable variation in the readings of different MSS. and versions.

rested on the seventh day; therefore Jehovah blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it'; Deut.v.15 reads 'And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day.'

Now how are these differences to be accounted for? It is admitted that the author of Deuteronomy was acquainted with Exodus; nay more, that he drew from thence his information on this very point. They cannot, then, have arisen from ignorance. Many of the variations are so trifling and unimportant (i.,ii.,iii.,iv.), that they cannot be ascribed to intentional alteration. They are just such as would be likely to arise, if the author of Deuteronomy were quoting the words from *memory*. He clearly was not copying from another document. Some of the inserted passages (v.) are merely expansions of the sense; *e.g.*, '*thine ox and thine ass and all* thy cattle', 'that thy days may be long, *and that it may be well with thee*', 'thy neighbour's house, or *his field*'; which might have formed part of the commandments as originally delivered, or might have been added by any one not particular about preserving the exact words. Others, however, are of a different kind; remarks of the speaker interspersed among the enactments of the law, which clearly could never have been uttered by God when first proclaiming them, and which therefore we must conclude Moses did not intend his hearers to regard as part of the ten commandments. These are the phrase 'as Jehovah thy God *commanded* thee', inserted in the fourth and fifth commandments; and still more strikingly the conclusion of the altered clause (vi.) in the former, 'therefore Jehovah thy God *commanded* thee to keep the sabbath day'. If these positions be allowed,—that the speaker here in Deuteronomy was well acquainted with the law as originally delivered, that he was quoting it from memory, without any particular care to preserve the exact words, and interspersing its enactments with remarks of his own,—if these positions be

allowed, as the facts before us certainly require, then the whole difficulty is at an end. A slight examination of the way in which the new clause at the end of the fourth commandment (the main discrepancy) is introduced, will shew at once that Moses never intended it to be regarded as part of the commandment, but simply as a remark of his own, to urge the people to obey what God had enacted. The original clause was connected on to the command as a reason for its *promulgation*.—'*For* in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth &c. . . . therefore *Jehovah blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it*'. The new clause is added merely as a reason why *they should observe it*, and is introduced very differently,—'*And remember* that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence, &c. . . . therefore Jehovah thy God *commanded thee to keep the sabbath day*'. The one in fact expresses God's reason for its observance, the other Moses'.

But to this it is objected, that the record in Deuteronomy professes, as much as that in Exodus, to give the *exact words;* and there is hence no alternative but to suppose, either that its author believed *his* version to be more correct than the other, or that he regarded that other as of so little authority, and the whole subject so mingled with fictitious circumstance, as to make it of no moment whether he agreed with it or not. The evidence upon which this objection is based is the way in which this version of the commandments is spoken of in the context. Deut.v.4,5 'Jehovah talked with you, face to face, in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire . . . *saying*, &c.', *v*.22 '*These words* Jehovah spake unto all your assembly in the Mount, . . . and He *added no more. And He wrote them in two Tables of stone, and delivered them unto me*'. The first of these passages would manifestly apply as well to a mere summary of the laws as to the commandments in full. *Which* was intended can only be determined by the context. The force of the second depends entirely upon the sense in which the expression 'words' is to be under-

'the *Priests*, the sons of Levi, the bearers of the ark'. (*c.*) In Nu.vi. 22-7 the duty of 'blessing in the name of Jehovah' is expressly assigned to the *Priests*, 'Aaron and his sons' (and comp.Lev.ix.22); in Deut.x.8 Jehovah is said to have separated the 'tribe of Levi' to 'bless in His Name'. (*d.*) In the earlier laws it is said that 'the Priests the sons of Aaron' were to *stand before Jehovah to minister unto Him*; this again in Deut.x.8,xviii.5,7,xxi.5 is set down as the office of the Levites generally. (*e.*) The declaration, 'I am thy part and thine inheritance among the children of Israel' is made in Nu.xviii.20 with reference to Aaron and his sons only (and comp.xxxi.28-9); the same is repeated in Deut.x.9,xviii.2 of the whole 'tribe of Levi'. (*f.*) The right of partaking of the sacrifices is confined by the earlier laws to the *Priests*, Lev.vi.18,29,vii.6; in Deuteronomy it is extended to all the Levites who chose to attend upon the sanctuary, xviii.1,8.

The great point to be determined here is, whether these differences (if fully established) are differences in *phraseology*, or differences in *fact*. They are curious and well worthy of consideration either way; but their importance as arguments for the later origin of Deuteronomy depends almost wholly upon their relation to actual customs and living facts. We shall first, therefore, examine the points of difference alleged in this light, and then proceed as before to consider how they may be most reasonably explained.

The statement made by Bishop Colenso that the Priests are '*invariably*' called 'sons of Aaron' in the earlier books, and 'sons of Levi' in Deuteronomy, although perhaps in the sense intended by him correct, is yet liable to very serious misunderstanding. It is quite true that the title 'sons of Aaron' never occurs in Deuteronomy, nor the title 'sons of Levi' in the other books; but it is *not* true that in either are these titles '*always*' employed to designate the Priests. The phrase 'sons of Aaron' &c. (either with or without 'priest' attached) occurs in Exodus 18 times, in Leviticus 50 times, in Numbers 10 times; 'Priest' alone, without any additional designation, in Leviticus 169 times, in Numbers 25 times. It is to be observed also, that 17 of the instances of 'sons of Aaron' in Leviticus, are cases where the individual members of his family were required to be designated,

and where therefore no other title could well be used. Omitting these, it would leave 61 instances of 'sons of Aaron' in all, to 194 of simple 'Priests'. The mere omission of this title in Deuteronomy cannot, therefore, be laid much stress upon.* In the same way, while the phrase 'sons of Levi' &c. occurs in Deuteronomy with reference to the Priests 7 times, there are also 5 other occasions where as before the simple 'Priest' is employed. Thus much premised respecting the true state of the case, we now turn to the all important question,—does this difference imply any change of law or usage concerning the Priests? does the use of the phrase 'sons of Levi' in regard to the Priests, imply that the distinction between them and the Levites proper was in any way abrogated or lessened? Bishop Colenso argues that it does. Let us see if facts will bear him out.

If we turn to the book of Joshua, we shall find precisely similar phrases to those referred to in Deuteronomy. Thus in iii.3, viii.33, we read of 'the Priests the Levites' bearing the ark; xiii.14 speaks of the 'tribe of Levi' having 'no inheritance', because 'the fire-offerings of Jehovah God of Israel were their inheritance' (comp.*v.*33), and again in xviii.7 because 'the priesthood of Jehovah was their inheritance'. This book of Joshua was unquestionably written *after* Deuteronomy,† from which doubtless its phraseology on these points was derived. Now what can we learn from it, as to the state of things implied by such expressions? The account of the allotment of the Levitical cities in chap.xxi. shews us that the distinction between the 'sons of Aaron the Priest who were *of the Levites*', and the Levites generally, was as clear and as strong as ever (see *v.*4,10,

* There are the whole chapters in Leviticus and Numbers which speak continually of the 'priests', but never as 'sons of Aaron', *e.g.* Lev.iv. (14 times), v. (13 times), xv. (6 times), xxiii. (4 times), xxvii. (11 times), Nu.v. (16 times), &c.

† This point will be fully discussed in chap.x.

13); the former also being in one place especially distinguished as 'the priests' (*v.*19). The two forms of expression are clearly, therefore, not incompatible. But there is yet another, even more important conclusion to be drawn from these facts. We have said that the book of Joshua is certainly *later* than Deuteronomy. If then at the time when *it* was written, the distinction between Priests and Levites still existed, however much their titles may appear to have become confused, *a fortiori* must this also have been the case in the earlier times of the Deuteronomist.

But again; we find exactly similar forms of expression in the writings of the prophets, both before and after the captivity, while yet in the histories of the same period the distinction is shewn to have been carefully maintained. We might instance Jeremiah, who always speaks of the Priests by the name of their tribe, and contrast his phraseology with the facts recorded in 2Chron.xxxv. concerning Josiah's Passover. But this latter was written some centuries after the events narrated, and is constantly decried by Bishop Colenso as unreliable. To adduce it in evidence would raise the whole question of the veracity of the Chronicler's statements, and only confuse the real point at issue. We therefore prefer to select an example from the post-captivity prophets, and contemporaneous history. There can be no doubt but that after the restoration from Babylon the distinction between Priests and Levites was carefully observed.* Yet do we find the prophet Malachi everywhere speaking of the Priests as *Levites*, and never as 'sons of Aaron' (ii.4-8,iii.3); nay, in two passages in the history (Ezra,x.5,Neh.xi.20) we have the very phrase so much insisted on in Deuteronomy, 'the Priests the Levites'. It is clear, then, that the custom of calling the Priests after the name of their tribe, was by no means incompatible with

* See especially Ezra,i.5,ii.36,40,70,iii.8,10,12,vi.16,18,20,vii.7,13, 24,viii.29,30,ix.1,Neh.vii.73,viii.13,x.38,xi.3,xii.30,44,47, &c.

the sharpest distinction in *practice*, between them and the subordinate Levites. The difference between Deuteronomy and the earlier books may thus after all be nothing more than a difference of phraseology. To determine precisely whether it is so or not, will require a detailed examination of the several points of divergence insisted on. Before, however, we can proceed to this, it will be necessary to ascertain, so far as we can, the relations between Priests, Levites, and people, as laid down and defined in the earlier history and laws.

The mention of 'Aaron *the Levite*' in Ex.iv.14 may perhaps imply, that even then, before the mission of Moses, the tribe of Levi had attained a certain pre-eminence above the others, with which the idea of priesthood may possibly have been connected. But however this may have been, it seems clear that such was not the primary design of the Mosaic institutions. The way in which the first-born are spoken of in Ex.xiii.2,12 (comp.Nu.iii. 12-3,41,45,viii.16-8), leaves little room for doubt, but that it was *they* who were originally intended to have performed the offices of the sanctuary; and so was Israel to have become 'a kingdom of *priests*' (Ex.xix.6). There were certainly 'priests' of some sort among the people before the appointment of Aaron, since we read of the 'priests, who step nigh unto Jehovah' in the account of the preparations for the giving of the Law (Ex.xix. 22,24). While the mention of 'the *lads* of the children of Israel' being appointed by Moses to offer 'burnt offerings' and sacrifice 'feast-offerings' unto Jehovah, at the time of the first covenant (Ex.xxiv.5), renders it almost certain that these 'Priests' were none other than the first-born. It was necessary, however, that some one should be appointed over these priests of the people, to perform the highest offices of the sanctuary, and so ensure a strict adherence to the forms and ceremonies about to be ordained. An indiscriminate scattered priesthood, in which all were on an equality, all might offer sacrifice and incense, all might minister alike, would inevitably have led to confusion and

contention, probably ere long to the introduction of rival sanctuaries and household gods, and so at last to idolatry and rebellion against Jehovah. To obviate these difficulties, and avoid these evils, Aaron and his sons were specially appointed as 'priests unto Jehovah' (Ex.xxviii.1,3,4,xxix.1,44, &c.). This appointment, it will be observed, was quite independent of the tribe to which he belonged. It was an Aaronic priesthood, not in any sense a Levitical one. It certainly also was not intended to supersede the general priesthood of the first-born, but merely to regulate and superintend it, and at the same time prevent the dangerous abuses to which it was open, by confining the most important part of the priestly office (the offering of incense and sacrifices in the sanctuary) to itself. The arrangement thus established was marred and overthrown by the sin of the golden calf. The fearful celerity with which the people fell back into idolatry, within a few weeks only of the solemn scene under Mount Sinai, when the jealous regard of Jehovah for the observance of his command against it had been proclaimed with trumpet-tongue before them all, within sight of that very peak from whence the awful voice had sounded, and where the thick cloud of the Divine presence still visibly rested, within a few weeks of their formal covenant, and promise to 'do all that Jehovah had spoken', and while Moses was yet with Him, receiving fresh instructions for their benefit;—this glaring rebellion against Jehovah showed the hopelessness of expecting anything but evil from such a priesthood as that of the first-born. At the same time the fidelity and zeal of the tribe of Levi, who alone of all the people declared themselves 'for Jehovah' (Ex.xxxii.26), pointed out where a fitting substitute for this scattered priesthood could be found. They had 'consecrated themselves' that day 'unto Jehovah', and he would give them 'a blessing' (*v.*29). They should be chosen out from their brethren for his especial service, to keep the charge of his dwelling, and minister unto all the congregation. They should

be to him instead of the first-born. They were nearly the same in number, the change could therefore be made without difficulty. The advantages to be derived from it were many. A tribe set apart for the service of God for all generations, was more likely to continue faithful, and would have far fewer temptations to defection, than a constantly changing series of individuals, gathered promiscuously from among all the people, and exposed to all the varied influences and party feelings which might lead them astray. The fact of their being the High-Priest's own tribe would also give strength to their attachment, and at all events impart a unity to the sacerdotal system, which it lacked before. Israel was not yet ripe for a national, unexclusive priesthood, because as yet she knew but little of national religion.

The duties and position of the Levites, when thus appointed to occupy the place of the first-born, may be briefly summed up as follows. They were to encamp around the Tabernacle, and guard it from the approach of 'strangers' (lit. 'laymen') Nu.i. 53,ii.17,iii.23,29,35,38; they were to set it up and take it down, and carry it with all the sacred vessels from place to place, none else might touch it, Nu.i.50-1,iii.7-8. This service was divided into several grades; the Aaronites or priests having to arrange for travel, and cover with costly cloths, the vessels of their ministry, and also take down the most holy parts; all which the Kohathites (to which family Moses and Aaron belonged) were to carry; the Gershonites had charge of the curtains and hangings, with their appliances; the Merarites of the boards, columns and attendant fastenings; iii.25-6,31,36-7,iv.4-20,24-8,31-2,x.17,21. Besides this they were commanded in general to 'minister unto Aaron', and 'serve the service of Jehovah' under the direction of their chief and his sons iii.6,9,viii.11,19,26; but what special further duties this implied we are not told.

This appointment of the whole tribe of Levi to the offices of the sanctuary materially altered the position of Aaron and his

sons. Hitherto, as before observed, they had held their priesthood merely as an individual family, specially appointed by God, and having no connection, beyond that of office, with the inferior priests around them. Now they were the heads of the priestly tribe. Each of the great Levitical families had its 'prince' (Nu.iii.24,30,35), and over all these was Eleazar, Aaron's son, 'prince of the princes of the Levites' (*v.*32). The various grades of service noted above helped still further to set the matter in this light. There was a difference between the Aaronites and the Kohathites certainly; but there was also another difference equally great between the Kohathites and the Gershonites; and yet again another between the Gershonites and the Merarites. The tribe of Levi thus stood clearly forth before the people as the priestly tribe, the house of Aaron merely as its head, to which the chief offices were reserved.

It was not strange that this change should have aroused the jealousy of the other tribes. They had been promised that they should be a 'kingdom of Priests', they had been told that they were a 'holy nation'; and now all this honour and dignity was made over to a single tribe; that tribe, too, the one to which Moses and Aaron themselves belonged. The exaltation of these two manifestly heaven-inspired leaders they might have borne, but the honour put by them upon their own tribe had so much the appearance of partiality, as to form a ready excuse for rebellion. This jealousy at the exclusiveness of the new sacerdotal system was undoubtedly the chief cause of the conspiracy headed by Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. They built a rival tabernacle (Nu.xvi.24,27), and endeavoured by all means in their power to incite the people generally against Moses and Aaron. And what was their plea? 'Ye take too much upon you, for *all the congregation are holy*, every one of them, and Jehovah is among them; why then lift ye up yourselves above the assembly of Jehovah?' (*v.*3). Two hundred and fifty princes were of their

company, who boldly dared to offer incense unto Jehovah, and were consumed with fire for their presumption. It has been sometimes supposed, indeed, that the chief cause of the conspiracy was the jealousy of Korah and the other Levites against Aaron and his sons. That this feeling had *some* share in it is evidenced by the rebuke of Moses to Korah, 'Hear, I pray you, ye sons of Levi. Is it too little for you, that the God of Israel hath separated you from the congregation of Israel, to bring you near unto himself, to perform the service of the Tabernacle of Jehovah, and to stand before the congregation to minister unto them? And he hath brought thee near, and all thy brethren the sons of Levi with thee; and seek ye the priesthood also? Therefore thou and all thy congregation are gathered against Jehovah,' (*v.*8-11). This rebuke however, be it observed, was merely addressed to Korah, not to the rebels generally, as in the previous verses (5-7). While that this was not the *popular* cause for discontent is evident in many ways. 1. No mention is made of it in the general accusation in *v.*3, but only of the exclusion of 'all the congregation'. 2. The conjoint leadership of Dathan and Abiram, heads of the tribe of Reuben the firstborn (who might therefore naturally be jealous of the exaltation of Levi), and the general sympathy of the people with their cause (xvi.41), are most improbable and inexplicable if the point at issue were merely the relative importance of different branches of the tribe of Levi. 3. Moses, when speaking to the rebels generally, says, 'Jehovah will make known who are his, and who are holy, and will cause him to *come near* unto him' (xvi.5), clearly implying that it was this 'coming near' unto Jehovah which they sought. When speaking to Korah and the Levites only, he says that Jehovah *had* 'brought them near unto himself', so that *they* clearly had the privilege after which the others were seeking. 4. After the punishment of the offenders and their sympathizers, in order to set the matter under dispute at rest for ever, God commanded Moses to take

twelve staves from the princes of the tribes, and lay them up before the testimony, and to 'write Aaron's name upon the staff of *Levi*' (xvii.3), and he would shew whom he would choose. Thereby clearly implying that it was a matter of jealousy among the *tribes*, not among the families of one particular tribe, which had to be set at rest. The fact seems to be, that Korah and some of the other Levites, finding this feeling of discontent generally prevalent among the people, and being themselves dissatisfied with their subordinate position, thought that by putting themselves at the head of the movement they might not only save themselves from popular obloquy, but very likely attain to a far higher position than that they now occupied. The rebellion was to be their *tool* to work out their own purposes. Moses, in his rebuke to Korah, charges him with this sinister motive, and exposes the artful policy he was pursuing. But to return from this digression. Two very important consequences followed upon this rebellion. 1st The priestly character of the *tribe of Levi*, and its identification with Aaron as its head, was established on firmer grounds than ever, confirmed in the most express manner by God himself. 2nd The relative positions and privileges of the Aaronites and other Levites were more clearly defined, in the law contained in Nu.xviii., probably delivered immediately after these events, and on their account. The provisions of this law, the only one distinctly bearing upon the point in the whole Pentateuch, will next engage our attention.

It confirmed the original distinction concerning the service of the sanctuary, that the Aaronites should have charge of the altar and holy things (when set in order in the Tabernacle), to which the Levites generally were forbidden to approach; while to these latter was committed the charge of the tent at large (*v.*3-7,23). It also again prohibited the approach of any 'stranger' (lit. 'layman'), *i.e.* clearly, any one not of the tribe of Levi (*v.*4-5,7,22). The law further regulated the

provision for each section of the priestly tribe; the Aaronites receiving the portions from the various sacrifices, the first-fruits and firstlings (*v.*8-19); the Levites generally, the tithes (*v.*21, 24-32). Two or three special phrases in this law also require notice. 1. The office of Aaron is invariably called '*your* priesthood' (*v.*1,7, comp.iii.10), not '*the* priesthood'; thereby implying that the other Levites also had a 'priesthood', though a subordinate one. 2. The connection of Aaron with the tribe of Levi is strongly brought out in the opening verses; 'Thou, and thy sons, and thy *father's house* with thee, shall bear the iniquity of the sanctuary; and thou and thy sons with thee shall bear the iniquity of your priesthood; and thy brethren also, the tribe of Levi, the *tribe of thy father*, bring thou with thee, that they may be attached unto thee, and minister unto thee' (*v.*1-2). We have here three groups, each more extensive than the other,—the Aaronites, the Kohathites (comp.iv.17-29), and the Levites. Aaron's priesthood had by this time quite lost its independent character, and become thoroughly Levitical. 3. Here for the first time it is distinctly laid down that the tribe of Levi should 'have no inheritance among the children of Israel' (*v.*20,23-4). When this law was promulgated we have no means of knowing with certainty, probably, however, during the second year of the sojourn, since the rebellion of Korah is most naturally placed immediately after the discomfiture of the Israelites at Hormah (Nu.xiv.45). There is certainly no ground whatever for assuming, with Bishop Colenso, that it was ordained only 'a few months previous' to the close of Moses' life.

The only further information on this subject, contained in the book of Numbers, is that concerning the cities which were to be given to the tribe of Levi for residence (xxxv.2-8). The only point specially worthy of notice here is the fact, that no mention is made of the house of Aaron as distinct from the Levites, the whole 48 cities being assigned in general to the tribe of Levi,

although subsequent history tells us that 13 of them were for the 'sons of Aaron' (Josh.xxi.4,10-9).

Taking now these facts as our guide, let us turn again to the examination of the differences alleged between Deuteronomy and the earlier books. And here firstly, we must remark, that by far the greatest proportion of the instances of the phrase 'sons of Aaron', occur *before* the appointment of the tribe of Levi to its sacred office, and when it was consequently the *only* special name by which they could be designated. All the instances in Exodus (18), and probably nearly all those in Leviticus (33), are of this kind. The few remaining ones in Numbers are mostly necessitated as a mark of distinction between the different sections of the tribe of Levi. It cannot therefore be said, that the earlier laws and history lay any stress upon the Aaronic character of the priesthood, in contradistinction to its Levitical. On the contrary, as we have seen, they continually set forth its intimate connection with the tribe of Levi in the clearest manner. Now then, what says the book of Deuteronomy?

1. Deut.x.8-9, 'At that time Jehovah separated the *tribe of Levi*, to bear the ark of the covenant of Jehovah, to stand before Jehovah to minister unto him, and to bless in his name, unto this day. Wherefore Levi hath no portion nor inheritance with his brethren; Jehovah is his inheritance, according as Jehovah thy God promised him.' It is objected, that several of the things here mentioned refer only to particular sections of the Levites, and more especially to the Aaronites. But does the text say it was not so? Does it say that *all* the Levites were to bear the ark, or minister unto Jehovah, or bless in his name? It was the duty of the Kohathites to bear the ark, of the Aaronites more especially, and of all the Levites in a subordinate degree, to stand before Jehovah and minister unto him, probably also to bless in his name.* Some of these phrases may

* There is not a word in Nu.vi.23-7 to *confine* the duty of blessing

not, indeed, be found distinctly applied to the Levites generally in the earlier books; yet certainly to 'minister unto the Tabernacle' (Nu.i.50), 'unto Aaron' (iii.6,xviii.2), 'to their brethren' (viii.26), 'to the congregation' (xvi.9), did amount to and imply a ministering 'unto Jehovah', and the phrase might therefore fitly be used of the whole tribe. The latter part of the passage unquestionably refers equally to all the descendants of Levi. Their having no inheritance in Israel is distinctly predicated in the earlier books of all the Levites (Nu.xviii.23-4, xxvi.62). While as a *promise* is referred to in Deut.x.9, there can be little doubt, but that the words spoken to Aaron, 'Thou shalt not inherit in their land, neither shalt thou have any portion in the midst of them; I am thy portion and inheritance among the children of Israel' (Nu.xviii.20, without doubt the passage alluded to), were addressed to him as the head of his tribe, not merely as an individual. The first part of this message manifestly applies to all, most probably therefore the latter also.* It is clear, then, that all the duties and privileges mentioned in Deut.x.8-9 did belong to some portion or other of the tribe of Levi, some of them to all. To suppose that Moses here meant to assert that each belonged equally to all is pure assumption. Several instances of similar inclusive passages, where the whole tribe is spoken of, without any special mention of the sons of Aaron, may be found in the book of Numbers (*e.g.* the two numberings of the people, i.47-9,ii.33,xxvi.57,62; and the Levitical cities, xxxv.2-8).

2. Deut.xviii.1-2,6-8, 'The priests the Levites, all the tribe of Levi, shall have no portion nor inheritance with Israel; they

---

the people to Aaron and his sons; though Bishop Colenso refers to it as if there were.

* Besides this passage, Bishop Colenso also urges as a proof of the 'sons of Aaron' *only* having Jehovah to be their inheritance, the fact of 'Jehovah's tribute' of the spoil of Midian being given to Eleazar (Nu.xxxi.28-9,&c.). We confess ourselves at a loss to see what it has to do with the question.

shall eat the fire-offerings of Jehovah and his inheritance, but they shall have no inheritance among their brethren; Jehovah is their inheritance, as he hath said unto them.' . . . 'And if a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Israel where he sojourned, and come with all the longing of his soul unto the place which Jehovah shall choose, and minister in the name of Jehovah his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, who stand there before Jehovah; they shall enjoy like portions, besides the sale of his patrimony'. That the Levites generally should eat of the sacrifices seems certainly contrary to the law laid down in Nu.xviii. Is this, however, really implied by the words before us? The main subjects of the command are unquestionably the Priests proper or Aaronites, the whole tribe of Levi being included because the having 'no portion or inheritance' applied equally to them. May not then the eating of the 'fire-offerings' only apply to the former? Again it will be observed, that *two* things are mentioned as given for their support,—'the *fire-offerings* of Jehovah, and *his inheritance*'. May not this last perhaps refer to the tithes, and so the first clause have to do with the Priests proper, and the second only with the Levites? Both these explanations are certainly tenable. Yet it seems, on the whole, more consistent with the general tenor of the passage to suppose that the Levites were included. Those, that is, who were actually engaged in the ministry of the sanctuary. These would of course be but a small proportion of the entire body, whether of Priests or Levites, and as they 'ministered unto the altar' more or less directly, it was but right that they should 'live of the altar'. This part of the law, then, which enjoined that *all* those engaged in the service of the sanctuary should partake of the holy things, we believe to be new. It is to be remembered, however, that although in former laws these holy things were allotted to the sons of Aaron and their families, it was never forbidden to share them with the attendant Levites. The old law was enlarged, not in any sense repealed.

3. Deut.xvii.9,18,xxi.5,xxvii.9, contain the expression 'Priests the Levites', or 'Priests the sons of Levi'; but in such connection that it is impossible to say which are meant, the Aaronites, or Levites generally, most probably however the latter. Deut.xxxi.9 speaks of the 'Priests the Levites who bare the ark', called in *v.*25 simply 'the Levites who bare the ark', where certainly the Kohathites (including the sons of Aaron) must be intended. It is clear from these passages that the terms 'Priest' and 'Levite' had not at that time the sharp distinctive sense which we (judging from later usage) are apt to assign them, but were regarded as almost synonymous.

This then, with the (probable) change of law just noted, are the only true divergences between Deuteronomy and the earlier books on this matter of Priests and Levites. Are they explicable on the supposition of the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy? Most easily. 1. We have already shewn how intimately the Aaronic priesthood was becoming blended with the Levitical, even in the early years of the sojourn; and also alluded to the inferior but true priesthood of the other families. These two elements, working for nearly 40 years, might well lead to the slight alteration in phraseology perceptible in Deuteronomy. The priests were Levites, and the Levites were priests; what wonder then if the two names became interchangeable? 2. A great alteration was about to be made in the manner of living of these Levites. Hitherto they had all lived in the immediate proximity of the Tabernacle, and had been sustained, like the rest of the people, upon the manna. Now they were to be settled in 48 different cities, some of which would be at considerable distances from the Tabernacle. This might present an obstacle to their coming up to perform their appointed service, since how were they then to fare? To obviate this difficulty it was now ordained, that such as did so should share the priests' provision from the sacrifices, to which they had indeed no right, yet which they richly deserved for their self-denial in leaving their homes to devote

themselves to the service of the sanctuary. In what way, or from what cause, these changes were likely to occur in the transition from David and Solomon's time to Josiah's, Bishop Colenso has not informed us.

3. It was provided by the earlier laws that the Levites should receive 48 cities as their inheritance (Nu.xxxv.1-8), and they are spoken of as well supplied with all the necessaries of life from the tithes and sacrifices of the people. In Deuteronomy, on the contrary, they are everywhere represented as stragglers in various parts of the land, living in 'any of the gates' of the people (xviii.6); they are continually coupled with the poor and destitute, 'the widow, the stranger, and the fatherless'; and are spoken of as depending like these upon the charity of others for subsistence.

The fact that Levi was to have 'no inheritance' among the tribes is, as already remarked, clearly laid down in the book of Numbers (xviii.21,23,24,xxvi.62); also that they were to be supported on the tithes of the people, and were, therefore, strictly dependent. Not one word is ever said of their being affluent, any more than it is said in Deuteronomy that they were poor. The people are exhorted not to forsake them (Deut.xii.19), and several special occasions are mentioned on which they were more particularly to remember them, and share their good things with them (xii.12,18,xvi.11,14,xxvi.11); the reason assigned being invariably, 'because they had no part or inheritance among them' (Deut.xii.12,xiv.29), just as we might have expected from what was said in the earlier books, never 'because they were poor and needy'. They are coupled with 'the stranger and the fatherless and the widow' (xiv.29,xvi.11,14, xxvi.11-3); but so are they also on other occasions with 'your sons and your daughters, your menservants and your maidservants' (xii.12,18). A sufficient proof that the reason for so coupling them was not their poverty,—for surely the 'sons and daughters' of the people were not poor,—but simply the relation in which they stood to the owners of the land,—dependence. So far, then, both codes are clearly agreed. With respect to the

Levites' place of residence, we may observe, that the phrase 'within thy gates' is clearly equivalent to 'in thy cities'; since no one supposes that all the strangers, fatherless and widows spoken of resided in the people's houses. Now this is just what the earlier law provided; that the Levites should have no inheritance of their own as a tribe, but should live in cities belonging to the *other* tribes, to be given them 'of their possession' (Nu.xxxv.2,8). Deuteronomy does not say that the Levites lived in the *same* cities with the rest of the people, the expression being clearly a general and indefinite one, as applicable to separate cities, as to a scattered dwelling throughout the whole land. It is probable, indeed, that these cities were not wholly Levitical, but that other people of the tribe to which they belonged also resided there. This appears prominently in the case of Hebron, which was awarded to Caleb as his inheritance, and continued to be so up to the time when the book of Joshua was written (Josh.xiv.13-5), and which yet was a Levitical city (xxi.11-3). Also from the fact, that only a limited portion of the ground belonging to each city was assigned to the Levites (Nu.xxxv. 2-5). And more especially from the law, which allowed of Levites selling and redeeming their houses, *i.e.* plainly, selling them to those who were *not* Levites (Lev.xxv.32-4). The expressions used in Deuteronomy, about the Levites living 'within the gates' of the rest of the people, are thus seen to be quite in accordance with the existence of Levitical cities, as enjoined in Numbers.

But, it is objected, the Deuteronomist says '*any* of the gates' of the people. This is scarcely a fair quotation: the passage runs, 'any of the gates *where he sojourned*', which may most naturally be understood to mean, 'any of the Levitical cities'. Commanding, that is, that the Levites who ministered at the sanctuary should not be confined to those from the immediately neighbouring cities, but that it should be open to a Levite to come from *any* of their cities, and assist in the service. The word 'sojourned' being used, because the proper place for the

Levites after all was unquestionably the sanctuary. These cities, too, were not their own, but others', and so they were in fact merely sojourners. But again, a little further on we have this remarkable expression concerning any Levite who thus came up to the sanctuary, 'They shall eat like portions, besides *the sale of his patrimony*'. The first part about partaking of the sacrifices we have already considered (p.238); but what means this latter clause, 'the sale of his patrimony'? If the Levites were utterly poor, and dependent upon alms for support, as Bishop Colenso tells us the Deuteronomist implies, what *patrimony* could they have to sell, when they came up to the Tabernacle, which should form an important item in their means of subsistence? When, however, we view the Levites as residing in houses of their own, although within their brethren's cities, and especially when we call to mind the regulations laid down in Lev.xxv.32-4 concerning the *sale* and redemption of these houses, the whole is clear at once, and the two sets of laws are seen to be in perfect concord. Lastly, we have the account of the actual appointment of these cities for the Levites, in Josh.xxi., written, as before observed, *after* Deuteronomy was completed (see chap.x.). A conclusive proof, that the difference, if such it can be called, is one only in appearance, and that the 'gates' of Deuteronomy are in truth none other than the 'cities' of Leviticus and Numbers, the state of things implied the very same.

4. It was provided, in Nu.xviii.21-32 that 'all the tenth in Israel' should be given to the Levites, and that they should 'eat it in every place.' In Deuteronomy, on the contrary, it is ordered that the tithes should be brought up to the sanctuary, and there be eaten by the man and his family, the Levites merely taking a share (xii.17-9); or even that, if the way were long, they might sell them, and afterwards spend the money upon such things as they desired, and feast upon *them* in the same way (xiv.22-7); while, further on, the tithes are spoken of as due only once in *three years*, and as belonging to 'the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless and the widow', to be eaten by them 'within thy gates' (xiv.28-9,xxvi.12-4). No mention is also made of the Priest's receiving the 'tenth of the tithe', as commanded in Nu.xviii.26-32.

In judging of such matters it is of importance to bear in mind, not only what *is* said, but also what is *not* said. One apparent difficulty in the case now before us is removed at once by the application of this principle. It is enjoined in Nu.xviii. that 'all the tithes' should be given to the Levites, it is *not* said *how often* the tithes were to be paid; they may have been annual, or biennial, or triennial, or even at greater intervals than these, for anything the law says about it. Now it is manifest, that in Deuteronomy *two* tithes are spoken of; one to be eaten by the man and his family and the Levites at the sanctuary (xii.11, 17-9,xiv.22-7), apparently an annual one*; the other to be given away to the Levites and the poor (xiv.28-9,xxvi.12-4), a triennial one. Both are spoken of in the same passage (xiv.22-9); to suppose, therefore, that the three years' tithe was an afterthought of the Deuteronomist, from a fear of his first regulation not being obeyed, as Bishop Colenso argues, is most improbable. No author would thus have altered his own legislation, so that one clause should contradict another immediately preceding it. Had he wished to make a change, his first step would surely have been to erase the original law, and then substitute the other for it. The assumption of two tithes is not, therefore, a mere hypothesis, to get over the contradiction between Numbers and Deuteronomy, as Bishop Colenso implies, but is a clear necessity from the statements of Deuteronomy alone, Numbers being left quite out of the question. This at once removes the main difficulty, the supposed *alteration* of the earlier laws. For it is clear, that if in Deuteronomy *two* tithes are spoken of, one as a kind of feast-offering to be eaten at the sanctuary, the other to be given to the Levites and poor in their own cities; and in Numbers mention is made of a tithe intended for the support of the Levites, to be eaten by them 'in every place', this must be

* Deut.xiv.22 'Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth *year by year*.'

identical with the last mentioned tithe in Deuteronomy, and not with the former; any differences with which are hence irrelevant. A few minor difficulties only now remain to be noticed.

1. How came it that no mention was made of the festival tithe in Numbers? We cannot say; certainly the law enjoining it was unnecessary until just before the entry into Canaan, since in the wilderness the people had no corn, or wine, or oil, to tithe; it may well therefore have been deferred till then. As before remarked, the supposition that the law in Nu.xviii. was delivered in the same year with the addresses in Deuteronomy is without any foundation in fact. It may be assigned with great probability to the second year of the sojourn. It is not, moreover, in any sense a law of tithes, defining what they were to be, or when they were to be paid, but merely a law for the *Levites*, deciding whence their living was to be derived, and what they were to do with it; particulars about *other* tithes, with which they were only remotely concerned, would have been most inappropriate.

2. There are several divergences of detail alleged between the law of the earlier books and that of Deut.xiv.28-9,xxvi.12-4. Thus (*a*) no mention is made in Deuteronomy of the *tenth of the tithe* for the Priest, Nu.xviii.26-32; (*b*) the tithe of *cattle* is similarly omitted, Lev.xxvii.32; (*c*) the tithe was to be shared with 'the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow', and not given wholly to the Levites, as in Nu.xviii.21; nay, it would almost seem as if the tithe-payer himself might partake of it, Deut.xxvi. 13-4. The first of these discrepancies is easily explained from the fact just noticed, that Nu.xviii. was intended for the guidance of the *Levites*, and it was therefore necessary to mention their heave-offering to Jehovah; while Deut.xiv.28-9, and xxvi. 12-4 were for the guidance of the *tithe-payers*, who had nothing whatever to do with it. The Levites' offering being in the place of first-fruits (Nu.xviii.27-30), it is unquestionably included in the first-fruits of the people generally, mentioned in Deut.xviii.4.

The second discrepancy alleged is one merely in appearance. The tithe of cattle is not mentioned as part of the festival-tithe in Deuteronomy (xii.17,xiv.22-3), this however, as we have seen, is peculiar to the later legislation. The tithe referred to in Lev.xxvii.32 was doubtless a Levites' tithe. Now with respect to *this*, no particular articles of produce &c. are mentioned in Deuteronomy, but it is simply said 'the tithe of thine *increase*' (xiv.28,xxvi.12), which would of course include the cattle. The third discrepancy has somewhat more of reality about it. The way in which the Levites' tithe is spoken of in Nu.xviii.21 certainly seems to imply that it was to be theirs exclusively, so that the command to give it unto 'the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow' as well, *may be* an innovation, rendered necessary by the altered circumstances of these latter in the land of Canaan, already alluded to (p.199). The discrepancy may, however, after all be only in appearance; the mention of the sharing of the tithes being unnecessary in a law for the adjustment of the relative positions, and means of subsistence, of the Priests and Levites, though essential in one for the direction of the tithe-payer. We shall prefer, however, to regard the difference as arising from purposed alteration. There is certainly nothing in Deut.xxvi.13-4 to shew that the tithe payer was to partake of his tithes. He disclaims having done so,—'I have not eaten thereof in my mourning, neither have I put away thereof unclean (*i.e.*, as *common* food), nor given thereof for the dead.' These instances being specially alluded to, no doubt, as those in which he would have been most likely to have used the tithes unlawfully; but *a fortiori* if he had not so used them in *these*, he had not so used them at all.*

* There is certainly no warrant for supposing these mourning or funeral feasts to have been either 'unlawful' or 'unbecoming', as Bishop Colenso assumes. It is also to be noted, that he *omits* in his quotation the phrase 'put away thereof *unclean*', which is certainly inclusive of all *common* uses; the expression 'unclean' being here clearly employed as opposed to 'hallowed' (see *v.*13, and comp.p.178).

5. Similar contradictions exist between the earlier and later laws concerning *firstlings*. In Nu.xviii.14-18 it is provided, that the firstlings should be given wholly to the *priest;* in Deut.xv.19-23 they are to be eaten by the man and his household. So again in Nu.xviii. 17 the redemption of firstlings is forbidden; in Deut.xiv.24-6 it is allowed, if the distance were great.

The ordinary explanation of this discrepancy,—that the firstlings mentioned in Numbers were males, those in Deuteronomy females,—is so opposed to the plain words of Deut.xv.19-20, as to be quite untenable. Kalisch's assumption, that the priest was to receive the breast and right leg merely, as in other feast-offerings, and the people to consume the rest, is *possible*, but requires an amount of twisting of the plain meaning of the text, 'the flesh of them shall be thine, *as* the wave breast and *as* the right leg are thine' (Nu.xviii.18), for which there seems no sufficient warrant. The law of firstlings in Deuteronomy is unquestionably a different one from that in Numbers; they are treated as feast-offerings instead of oblations (comp.Lev.ii.,vii.11-34). It is to be observed that the law of *first-fruits* remained unaltered (Lev.ii.14-6,comp. Deut.xviii.4,xxvi.2-10). The redemption allowed in Deut.xiv. 24-6, also, was only a partial one, the animals being sold, and others bought with the money instead of them. Redemption proper was the substitution of entirely different animals (*e.g.* a lamb for an ass &c.), or the payment of its value + one-fifth (Ex.xiii.13,Lev.xxvii.27).

These alterations in the laws first laid down clearly indicate, 1. either a greater abundance of firstlings, which rendered the assignment of all the flesh to the priests unnecessary, or a smaller number of priests to be supported; 2. a greater distance between the people's dwellings and the sanctuary. Now there can be no doubt, but that the number of firstlings offered in the wilderness was very small, the number to be expected in Canaan very large; while at the same time the dispersion of the priestly tribe into the cities assigned to them would materially diminish the number of those to be supported. Equally clear is it, that the distance

from which the worshippers would have to come would be enormously increased from what it had been in the camp; and it is to be noted that on *this ground only* was the partial redemption, described above, permitted. On the supposition, then, that the first set of laws were laid down during the earlier years of the sojourn, and intended especially for their wilderness life, the second promulgated at its close, and intended for the land of Canaan, all is clear and straightforward. According to Bishop Colenso, however, the first set were made in the reign of Solomon, when the kingdom of Israel was in its most flourishing condition, and at its largest size, the Temple-service just established, and possessing all the charm of novelty, the firstlings most plentiful, the average distance greatest. The second set in the reign of Josiah, when the country was depopulated and poor, its boundaries confined to two tribes merely, the religious state of the nation fearfully low, the firstlings few, the average distance least. The only explanation which Bishop Colenso has to offer for the change is, indeed, the *non-observance* of the older law, which he argues led to these easier and lighter enactments of Jeremiah, as a sort of compromise. Which explanation is most consistent with the nature of the changes made, and the dignity of a divinely-authoritative legislation, we leave the reader to judge.

6. In the account of the provision for the priests, Deut.xviii.3-5, it is said, that their 'due' from the people's sacrifices was to be 'the shoulder, and the two cheeks, and the maw'; whereas in the earlier laws it was to be the breast and hind-leg (Ex.xxix.27-28,Lev.vii.31-4, x.14,Nu.vi.20,xviii.18). Also no mention is made in these latter of the 'first of the fleece of thy sheep', Deut.xviii.4.

In considering these regulations concerning the priest's portion of the sacrifices, it is necessary to bear carefully in mind *which* sacrifices are spoken of, as the practice was very different in different cases. Thus the 'burnt offering' was wholly burnt, the priest only receiving the skin (Lev.i.,vi.9-13, vii.8); the 'oblation' was wholly his, except a handful burnt

for a memorial (Lev.ii.,vi.14-8,vii.9-10); the 'sin-offering' and the 'guilt-offering' were also wholly his (Lev.vi.25-30,vii.1-7). Now the passages referred to above, about the wave breast and hind-leg, concern the 'feast-offerings' and nothing else. The question is, therefore,—does the regulation laid down in Deut. xviii.3 also refer to 'feast-offerings'? If not, there clearly is no contradiction. The passage runs thus, 'And this shall be the priest's due from the people, from them that sacrifice a sacrifice, whether one of the herd, or one of the flock; and they shall give unto the priest the shoulder, and the two cheeks, and the maw.' Here, it will be seen, is no mention of 'feast-offerings', but of 'sacrifices'. The word is a generic one, and is applied to offerings of all kinds, nothing can therefore be determined from it either way. The mere fact of the difference in question existing between the 'sacrifices' here named and the 'feast-offerings', would be sufficient to warrant us in concluding them not identical. There is indeed as much reason for believing them to be identical with 'burnt-offerings' or 'sin-offerings' &c., as with 'feast-offerings'. But it may be asked,—if so, to what *do* they refer? We do not hesitate to answer, with Josephus and Philo, that they refer to the ordinary slaughterings of animals for food, which are distinctly called by this name in Lev.xvii.5,7,8 (comp.Deut.xii.15,21). These would be generally, no doubt, offered at home (see below p.250), sometimes however at the sanctuary, and commonly in the priestly cities, in which cases apparently the priest was to claim the shoulder, the two cheeks, and the maw. No regulation as to the priest's portion of these sacrifices is contained in the earlier legislation.* By

* In Lev.xvii.5, indeed, these 'sacrifices' are called 'feast-offerings', but nothing is said about the wave breast or hind-leg. This word is also sometimes used apparently in a generic sense. If the contrary be held, then of course the regulation in Deuteronomy must be regarded as a modification of that originally laid down. The view in the text is, however, the more probable.

what rule Bishop Colenso determines this verse to be a full statement of the priest's income, which omits all mention of feast-offerings, sin-offerings, guilt-offerings, or oblations, the chief sources from which it was derived, we are at a loss to understand. The first-fruits of *wool* are certainly peculiar to this passage.

7. The Deuteronomist confines all sacrifices to *one place*, and lays great stress upon the destruction of high places &c.; whereas the other books say nothing about this, and in one passage speak expressly of *many* places of worship, Ex.xx.24.

A striking proof of the authenticity and minute accuracy of the two records. There can be no question, but that the earlier laws confined all sacrifices to the Tabernacle, even beasts to be slain for food being required to be brought there, under penalty of excommunication, or even death (Lev.xvii.8-9, see p.166). High places for worship, distinct from the Tabernacle, were clearly, therefore, as opposed to the injunctions of the earlier, as of the later laws. And yet in Ex.xx.24 we read 'In *all places* where I mention my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee'. Suppose that this was written in the days of David or Solomon, and Deuteronomy in those of Josiah, and there is certainly a remarkable contradiction. Suppose, however, that these words were uttered, as the history says they were, three months after the Exodus, and when the sanctuary would be continually moving *from place to place*; while the laws in Deuteronomy were spoken just before the entry into Canaan, when the sanctuary was about to become *fixed*, and all is natural and consistent. The remarks of Bishop Colenso as to the observance of the laws of sacrifice &c., at different periods of Jewish history, will be considered further on (chap.xi.).*

* The phraseology of Deuteronomy here is also not to be overlooked. The sanctuary is invariably called 'the *place*', never 'the *house*'; in Jeremiah we have 'house' 31 times, 'temple' twice,

8. In the earlier laws all animals for slaughter were ordered to be brought to the Tabernacle and slain there (Lev.xvii.1-9). In Deuteronomy it is expressly allowed that they should be killed at home (xii.15-6). Also in Leviticus the command was to *cover* the blood *with dust* (xvii.13); while in Deuteronomy it is merely said, that they should *pour it out upon the ground like water* (xii.16,24,xv.23).

The main objection here is of a very similar character to the last. There certainly is a difference, and a very marked one, between the two laws; but it is one fully accounted for by the change of circumstance corresponding to the times of their delivery. In the wilderness (to which Lev.xvii. manifestly refers,*) the bringing of animals for slaughter to the Tabernacle was perfectly practicable, and was therefore enjoined; in Canaan it would be impossible, and so they were allowed to slaughter them at home. To suppose that the first law was intended for the days of David and Solomon, when there were *twelve* tribes; and the second for those of Josiah, when there were *two*, is contradictory and absurd. That the difference in phraseology about pouring out the blood, did not imply any difference in meaning, may be seen by a reference to Ezek.xxiv.7 where both phrases are employed 'she poured it not upon the earth to cover it with dust'. The warnings against eating blood are certainly quite as strong in Deuteronomy as in the earlier books.

9. While the Deuteronomist strictly enjoins the observance of the other three Great Feasts and the Passover (xvi.1-17), he yet makes no mention whatever of the 'Feast of Trumpets', or the 'Day of Atonement', the celebration of which are enforced quite as solemnly in the earlier laws (Lev.xxiii.23-32,Nu.xxix.1-11). Also in the regulations for the Passover, cattle are allowed to be used as well as lambs or kids (Deut.xvi.2), in opposition to the original command (Ex.xii.13,21).

'place' only once, and then of the *Tabernacle at Shiloh*, not the Temple at Jerusalem (vii.12). The other instances of 'place' seem to refer to the *land* (*e.g.* vii.7,14).

* This is shewn by the mention (1) of the 'camp' in *v.*3; (2) of the 'open field' in *v.*5; and (3) the 'hairy ones' (= mountain goats, E.V. 'Devils') in *v.*7.

Four times in the Pentateuch are the festivals enumerated, nearly every time with a different purpose. 1. Ex.xxiii.14-7 (part of the first set of miscellaneous laws), where the observance of the three great feasts is enjoined in brief, no others being mentioned. 2. Lev.xxiii., where the various 'convocations of holiness' throughout the year are enumerated, the the sabbath (*v.*3), the Passover (*v.*5), the feast of unleavened bread (*v.*6-8), the two offerings of first-fruits, at intervals of seven weeks (*v.*9-22), the feast of trumpets (*v.*23-5), the day of atonement (*v.*26-32), the feast of ingathering or tabernacles (*v.*33-43). 3. Nu.xxviii.-ix., where the *offerings* to be made throughout the year are enumerated, the daily sacrifice (xxviii.1-8), the sabbath-offerings (*v.*9-10), those for the new-moons (*v.*11-5), and then on to the festivals and days of convocation, just as in Lev.xxiii. 4. Deut.xvi.1-17, where again none but the three great feasts are mentioned, and attendance at them enforced. It is manifest that 1 and 4 are agreed, while 2 and 3 cover a much larger space. And the reason for this is equally obvious; the object in 2 and 3 was to enumerate all the days of observance or sacrifice, that in 1 and 4 merely to name the times of necessary attendance at the sanctuary. But the 'feast of trumpets' and the 'day of atonement', however important their observance might be, were *not* times of attendance. They therefore did not come within the scope either of Ex.xxiii. or Deut.xvi. The phrase, 'Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before Jehovah', which closes both passages (Ex.xxiii.17,Deut.xvi.16), explains at once why none of the other days of observance were mentioned. If silence of this kind is to be construed as contradiction, we might as well conclude that the author of Leviticus knew nothing of the new-moon or daily offerings, the authors of Exodus and Deuteronomy nothing of the sabbath; for the silence is quite as marked. With respect to the Passover, the use of oxen was no doubt an innovation on the custom at the first observance. For what purpose it was introduced we

cannot say, but there certainly is nothing to lead us to assign it to a later date than Moses. The passover had now been in abeyance for 39 years.* A better opportunity for effecting any change in its details, which might seem advisable, could not possibly be conceived.

10. In Deut.xii.27 it is said, that the blood of their sacrifices should be 'poured out upon the altar'. Various regulations are given as to the blood, in the earlier laws, such as 'sprinkled round about upon the altar', 'wrung out at the side', put on the horns, at the bottom &c., &c., but never 'poured out *upon* the altar'.

The passage in Deuteronomy is *generic*, including all the various forms which might be used in particular cases, and could not therefore agree verbally with any. The word translated 'pour' (שָׁפַךְ), is more strictly 'shed', and by no means defines the manner of pouring out, whether by sprinkling, wringing &c. The preposition 'upon' (עַל) is exactly the same which is used in the other phrases, 'sprinkled round about *upon* the altar' '*upon* or *at* the side' '*upon* the horns' &c. It is clear, therefore, that no difference of usage is implied; and the expression is, for the purpose for which it was intended, perfectly accurate.

11. The laws concerning unclean animals laid down in Lev.xi. and Deut.xiv.1-20 differ from each other, in that the former omits the names of the clean beasts, and one unclean bird, which the latter inserts; and inserts the names of eight unclean animals among the 'creeping things', which the latter omits. Also Deut.xiv.19 forbids any 'creeping thing that flieth' being eaten, while Lev.xi.21-3 *allows* under this head four kinds of locusts. The statement that is made in both laws, as to the *hare* 'chewing the cud' is untrue, as the hare is not a ruminant animal, and consequently has not the power to do so.

Amidst the privations of the wilderness, when flesh-meat was very scarce and eagerly longed for, there was doubtless a greater temptation to use unclean animals, and the list had therefore to be more full and explicit, than was necessary in that intended

---

* See Hist. Charact. Pent. p.154.

for the people's guidance in the land of Canaan. The permission to eat 'locusts' (peculiar to the earlier law) is also very characteristic. They were clean animals which the Israelites would gladly avail themselves of in the desert, but which they would certainly refuse in the land of Canaan; a repetition of the permission was therefore unnecessary. How such a difference can be explained on the assumption that one law expressed the custom in the days of David and Solomon, the other that in the days of Josiah, it is hard to see.

With respect to the *hare*, there can be no doubt but that the Mosaic statement is *anatomically* inaccurate. But was anatomical exactness the object, or even a necessary adjunct, of the law? Surely not; the object was simply to define what animals might, and what might not, be eaten. And for this purpose two characteristics were selected, 'chewing the cud' and 'cleaving the hoof'. Every animal which possessed *both* these characteristics was to be regarded as clean, every one which lacked *either* as unclean. Now how were the people to decide upon these points? Were they all forthwith to become students of anatomy and physiology?—were they all to turn dissectors, and examine the stomach and intestines of every animal, before they ventured to partake of it?—was it thus that they were to determine whether an animal chewed the cud or not? It is manifest, that the only guide which the people *could* follow in such a case, was *appearance*. By the rule of *appearance*, then, must all the provisions of the law be made, to be effectual. But it is admitted, that in *appearance* the hare *does* 'chew the cud'; and many non-scientific observers have recorded it as a well-known and undoubted fact. It is clear, then, that, for the purposes of the Mosaic law, the hare *must* be classed among animals chewing the cud.* To make a statement of this kind,

* It is to be observed that the statement to this effect, whether accurate or inaccurate, at least involves no *practical consequence*. The

occurring in such a place and for such a purpose, an argument against the accuracy and authenticity of the Pentateuch, is absurd. To suppose that on such matters the letter of Scripture is to be regarded as divinely inspired and infallible is scarcely less so. One might as well argue that the Saviour's statement of the 'sun *rising* upon the evil and the good', involving as it does an astronomical inaccuracy, was a proof of the non-authenticity of the New Testament, or a ground for rejecting the Copernican hypothesis. The cases are precisely parallel.

12. In Deut.xv.1-11 it is enjoined, that in the seventh year there should be a 'release' from debts, *i.e.* a suspension of claim. Neither of the earlier laws concerning the Sabbatical year make any mention of such a custom (Ex.xxiii.10-1,Lev.xxv.1-7).

Both these laws refer certainly exclusively to the land, but the further regulation respecting debts is quite in keeping with the spirit of their enactments. To ascribe it to Jeremiah, at a time when the original laws were wholly neglected, is a most improbable hypothesis; especially as it is distinctly a command, not, as Bishop Colenso would insinuate, a mere 'suggestion' or 'recommendation'. Moses' humanity and consideration for the poor and needy, as evidenced in the earlier laws (comp. Ex.xxii. 21-7,xxiii.6-9,Lev.xxv., &c.), was at least equal to Jeremiah's; and such an extension of the law quite in keeping with the characteristics of his latest legislation, which was especially designed to fill up the gaps existing in the former.

13. The law concerning Hebrew servants in Ex.xxi.2-6 differs from that in Deut.xv.12-8, in three particulars; (*a*) the latter names both *maid-* and *man*-servant, the former only the man-servant; (*b*) the latter commands means of sustenance to be given the bondman when set free, which the former omits; (*c*) the latter says nothing about the ear-boring taking place *in the presence of the judges*, as enjoined by the former.

---

hare was rejected as unclean because it 'divided not the hoof', its chewing the cud is merely mentioned as a circumstance which *might* lead the Israelites to regard it as clean.

The release both of married and unmarried female servants is distinctly provided for in Ex.xxi.3,7-8,11. Such means of sustenance as are spoken of in Deuteronomy (sheep, corn, and wine) could not, for the most part, be given in the wilderness, and are therefore naturally first mentioned just before the entry into Canaan. The word translated 'judges' is 'Elohim', generally translated 'God', and may therefore merely imply that the covenant between master and servant was to be regarded as a religious one, not that it was done away from home, which indeed the expression 'the door or the door-post' (*v.*6) seems distinctly to contradict. Such variations in minutiæ are just what might be expected in laws repeated freely from memory by the original lawgiver, but are most unnatural in the deliberate forgery of one who wished his work to be regarded as Mosaic. In such a case the most servile imitation would almost certainly have been displayed.

14. In Deut.xix.1-10 directions are given respecting the six cities of refuge; it is commanded to separate three cities speedily, and then if their coast was enlarged three more; these of course correspond with the three cities on the east of Jordan, and the three on the west. But then in Deut.iv.41-3 the three on the east are said to have been already appointed by Moses, before this address was delivered. When compared with the older law in Nu.xxxv., several differences are also apparent; thus (*a*) the Deuteronomist says nothing about their being *Levitical* cities; (*b*) he *adds* the direction to 'prepare a way' to them; (*c*) he *omits* all reference to the slayer's abiding in the city until the death of the High Priest.

The main difficulty here is very easily removed. Moses is represented as addressing the people in the land of Moab, after the conquest of Sihon and Og, and the occupation of the territory east of Jordan. That the author, whoever he was, can have forgotten this circumstance is incredible. He is looking forward to a yet future conquest,—'When Jehovah thy God hath cut off the nations, whose land Jehovah thy God giveth thee, and thou inheritest them, and abidest in their cities, and in their houses' (Deut.xix.1);—that is clearly the territory west of Jordan.

Then, he says, when these things are so, 'Thou shalt separate *three* cities for thee in the midst of the land' (*v.*2);—that is of course, the land about to be conquered. He really, therefore, makes no reference to the three cities in the territory already conquered at all; and why? No doubt, because they were already appointed; in accordance with the statement of iv.41-3. Then, he goes on to say, 'If Jehovah thy God *enlarge* thy boundary',—that is, manifestly, *over and above* the land whose conquest you are now about to undertake,—'enlarge thy boundary as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, and give thee *all the land* which he promised to thy fathers, . . . then shalt thou add three cities more for thee, besides these three' (*v.*8,9). Now what was 'all the land which He promised'? Unquestionably the vast tract, extending from remotest Lebanon to the desert of Sinai, from Euphrates to the Nile, described in i.7-8. But, as before remarked, only a small portion of this was to be possessed at present,* and for this portion the three cities west of Jordan were intended. When the *whole* should be possessed, then three cities more must be added. The fact, that in this address Moses mentions six cities and no more, as to be appointed, so far from contradicting the statement in iv.41-3, confirms it, since had not Moses himself already appointed the three eastern cities, he must have mentioned *nine*, instead of six. With respect to the minute differences between the law here and in the earlier books, we have nothing further to say beyond what was remarked before;—how natural such differences are, on the supposition of both laws being Mosaic, the one written and the other spoken; how unnatural, if the latter be regarded as an imitation of the former.

These are all the instances of discrepancies in laws, alleged by Bishop Colenso in support of his theory of the later origin of

---

* See this subject of the extent of the promised land, fully discussed in Hist. Charact. Pent. p.162-7.

Deuteronomy. We have seen that in most cases they are discrepancies in appearance merely, or such as arise from greater fulness and circumstantiality in one or other of the laws compared, and therefore quite compatible with common origin. In the few cases where real difference exists, this has been found to admit of easy and sufficient explanation from the altered circumstances of the times when the two sets of laws were promulgated, and thus to furnish a strong confirmatory argument for the authenticity of both, and of the history with which they stand connected. In no case has there appeared the slightest ground for ascribing the laws of Deuteronomy to a later date than the conquest of Bashan, or to any other lawgiver than Moses.*

* The other objections concerning laws will be found discussed at length in chap.ix.,xi. and Append.No.3.

CHAPTER IX.

DEUTERONOMY,—SIGNS OF TIME.

(BISHOP COLENSO, PART II., CHAP. V.—VI., PART III., CHAP. IV.—VII., X., XII.—XX. (IN PART))

IN addition to the peculiarities of phraseology, and the discrepancies in narrative and laws, considered in the last two chapters, all of which are urged by Bishop Colenso as signs of later, as well as diverse, origin, there are a number of anachronisms and other special signs of time, on which he strongly insists. These will form the subject of the present chapter. In Bishop Colenso's work they are scattered about in all directions, as was indeed inevitable from the method of examination adopted; and the same ones often appear in two or three places. To avoid confusion we shall follow the same course as in the preceding chapter, and consider them in groups arranged according to subject, rather than in the original order of mention. We shall commence with those dependent upon phraseology.

1. The Deuteronomist addresses the people as if they were the same who had come forth out of Egypt, and passed through all the trials of the wilderness, forgetting that, according to the story, the whole of that generation had passed away (Nu.xxvi.64). Thus in i.9 he says 'I spake unto *you* at that time', *v.*14 '*ye* answered me', *v.*22 '*ye* came near unto me, *every one of you*', *v.*25 the spies 'brought *us* word again' &c. &c.; while in v.2-3 it is still plainer, 'Jehovah our God made a covenant with *us* in Horeb. Jehovah made not this covenant with our fathers, but *with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day*'; and so too xi.2-7 'I speak not with *your children*, which have not known His miracles and His acts, which He did in the midst of Egypt, unto Pharaoh the king of Egypt, and unto all his land, &c.; but *your*

eyes have seen all the great acts of Jehovah which He did'. Neither Moses, or any contemporary writer, could have so lost sight of the entire change which had taken place among the people.

The general anachronism here objected is very easily explained. Moses was addressing the people in their *collective* capacity as a nation, and therefore naturally spoke of all their national acts in the first or second person, whether the individual actors were alive and present still, or not. That this is so, is evidenced by the continual change of number and person throughout his discourses, and especially by the frequent use of the singular 'thou', which can only be understood in this way. The following analysis of the first eleven chapters of Deuteronomy will shew the extent to which this is carried.

Deut.i.6 we, 9-18 you, 19 we, 19-20 you, 21 thou, 22-3 you, 25 we, 26-30 you, 31 thou, 32-46 you; ii.1 we, 7 thou, 8,13-4,29 we, 30 thou, 32-7 we, 37 thou; iii.1-12 we, 18-26 you, 29 we; iv.1-3 you, 3 thou, 4-6 you, 7 we, 8 you, 9-10 thou, 11-6 you, 19 thou, 20-1 you, 21 thou, 22-3 you, 23-5 thou, 25-8 you, 29-33 thou, 34 you, 35-40 thou; v.1 you, 2-3 we, 4-5 you, 22-33 you; vi.1 you, 2-3 thou, 3 you, 4 we, 5-13 thou, 14 you, 15 thou, 16-7 you, 18-21 thou; vii.1-4 thou, 4-5 you, 6 thou, 7-8 you, 9-11 thou, 12 you, 12-4 thou, 14 you, 15-21 thou, 21 you, 22-4 thou, 25 you, 26 thou; vii.1 you, 1-19 thou, 19-20 you; ix.1-7 thou, 7-25 you; x.9-15 thou, 15-9 you, 20-2 thou; xi.1 thou, 2-9 you, 10 thou, 10-1 you, 12 thou, 13-4,16-9 you, 19-20 thou, 21-8 you, 29 thou, 31-2 you.

Very frequently, it will be seen, 'we' 'thou' and 'you' are interchanged in the same verse (*e.g.* i.19,ii.37,iv.21,25,vi.3, vii.4,12,14,21,25, viii.1,19,ix.7, x.15, xi.10,14,19); a sufficient proof of their identity in meaning, and, as a consequence, of the collective sense in which the latter is employed throughout. Two of the passages alleged, however, (v.2-3,xi.2-7) are incapable of this explanation, and will require separate consideration. In the first, it will be observed, the people then present are contrasted with their 'fathers', in the second with their 'children'. Now why this mention of their fathers? If, as Bishop Colenso would have us believe, the speaker regarded his audience as the

very same which had stood under Mount Horeb and received the law, why should he have thought it necessary to warn them that the covenant concerned *them*, and not their fathers? There must clearly have been some ground for fear in the speaker's mind, lest the people should regard the covenant as having nothing to do with them, but only with their fathers. On Bishop Colenso's hypothesis of an anachronism this is wholly inexplicable. Suppose, however, that the words were spoken by Moses in the fortieth year, and all is plain. The covenant at Horeb had been made in *fact* with the fathers of those then present, but in spirit it equally concerned themselves. Nay, *more*. For the covenant had to do with the land of Canaan; its commands, its promises, its institutions, all found their proper development in Canaan, not in the wilderness. They, therefore, and not their fathers, were the true partakers of the covenant, of them first was its full observance to be demanded, on them first its full blessings to be bestowed. Thus, in their most literal sense, were the words of Moses true, 'Jehovah made not this covenant with our *fathers*, but with *us, even us, who are all of us alive here this day*'. But then, how of the other passage, where the people are contrasted with their 'children'? It will be observed, that here the matter is merely one of *witness*; they had seen the mighty works of Jehovah, their children had not. Now since it was only those over 20 years of age who were sentenced to die in the wilderness (Nu.xiv.29), it is clear that a very large number of those who were assembled in the plains of Moab had literally come out of Egypt. If Bishop Colenso's estimate of the number of males under 20 at the Exodus (3-400,000) be right,* and one half of these be supposed of sufficient age to remember the stirring events of their youth,—and every one knows that the occurrences of youth are always the best remembered,—then there must have been one fourth, or, allowing for deaths, at least one-fifth of the

* See Part I., p.35-6.

whole population at the close of the sojourn, who would have a vivid recollection of the Exodus and its attendant wonders. Moses was addressing 'all Israel', by which we understand of course the princes, elders and officers, the representatives of the entire host, so frequently spoken of under that collective title.* Now from which section of the people were these most likely to be chosen, from those under 50 years of age, or from those between 50 and 60? We do not hesitate to say from the latter, both on account of their superior age, and their personal experience in the very matter now before us, the wonders of the Exodus. But if so, then again, the words of Moses, that their children had not known, but that they had, are shewn to be literally true. Would any later writer, whose ideas of time were so confused as Bishop Colenso would represent, and who altogether overlooked the forty years of sojourn, and the sentence of death upon the adult males,—would *he* have been likely thus to contrast his imaginary audience both with their 'fathers' and their 'children', and that so strictly in accordance with the very facts whose existence he was overlooking?

2. In two places in Deuteronomy the expression 'unto this day' occurs, which implies that some considerable time had elapsed since the events spoken of; (*a*) Deut.iii.14, the conquest of Argob by Jair, and the calling of the cities after his name, which took place after the conquest of Bashan, and therefore within a very short time of Moses' death; (*b*) xxxiv.6, 'No man knoweth of his (Moses') sepulchre unto this day'. These portions must clearly, then, have been written many years after the death of Moses.

That the narrative of Moses' death is post-mosaic, there can be no doubt (see pp.4,156). His sepulchre would be sure to become an object of search immediately after his decease (comp. 2Kings,ii.16-8), so that the lapse of a few years would be quite sufficient to warrant such an expression being used concerning it.

---

* See Hist. Charact. Pent. p.108-111.

The other instance named occurs in a verse, which there is every reason to believe is an interpolation of the compiler of Moses' speeches, or some later editor. The whole passage runs as follows. 'And this land, which we possessed at that time, from Aroer, which is by the brook Arnon, and half Mount Gilead, and the cities thereof, *gave I* unto the Reubenites and to the Gadites. And the rest of Gilead, and all Bashan, the kingdom of Og, *gave I* unto the half-tribe of Manasseh, all the line of Argob, with all Bashan, which was called the land of Refaim. (Jair the son of Manasseh *took* all the line of Argob unto the boundaries of Geshuri and Maachathi, and called them after his own name Bashan-havoth-Jair, unto this day.) And *I gave* Gilead unto Machir,' &c. (iii.12-5). The change in person and phraseology here is very marked, 'Jair took', not 'I gave unto Jair', as the context would have led us to expect (comp.x.6-7, considered p.215). It is best regarded, therefore, as a *note*, suggested to the compiler by the mention immediately before of this very 'line of Argob', which Jair conquered. Several similar notes will be shewn to have been made in this first address, as we proceed. A comparison of this passage with Jud.x.3-4, where another and later Jair is mentioned, whose sons had possession of these same cities, renders it probable that it was written before his judgeship, since no mention is made there of the original conquest, or true occasion of the name being given. When exactly this took place it is impossible to determine.

3. In two passages the phrase 'as it is this day' is employed concerning circumstances of later date than Moses; (*a*) Deut.iv.38 'To drive out nations from before thee greater and mightier than thou art, to bring thee in, to give thee their land for an inheritance, *as it is this day*'; (*b*) xxix.28 'And Jehovah rooted them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land, *as it is this day*'. The first referring to the conquest of Canaan, the second to the captivity of the Ten Tribes.

The fact that before these addresses were delivered a large portion of the promised territory had been conquered, Sihon and

Og displaced, and their land assigned to the two and a half tribes as an inheritance, will sufficiently explain the first of these instances, as indeed Bishop Colenso himself seems to admit, though of course preferring the reference to the land of Canaan. This conquest of Sihon and Og is often alluded to as an earnest of future success, and an occasion of terror to the Canaanites (comp. Deut.iii.21, xxix.7-8, xxxi.4, Josh.ii.10, ix.10, &c.). The second instance mentioned occurs in a prophecy of Moses concerning the captivity of the people if they refused to obey God's commandments, and is part of the answer, which he said should be given to nations who inquired into the cause of their calamities. The words were not spoken in his own person, as referring to his own time, but in the person of these expounders of God's judgments, and with reference to the events and circumstances *then* present.* To regard them as an expression of his own experience, is to destroy their proper connection and force altogether. Scott's view, that they were added by Ezra, or some scribe of his days is scarcely less objectionable, and is equally opposed to the true meaning of the passage. Only, then, by ignoring the prophetical character of this address of Moses, can the words be wrested to imply a sign of time. And this Bishop Colenso practically does, in this and several other instances, although, it would seem, admitting the possibility of prophecy in the abstract.

4. In Deut.ii.12, when speaking of the ancient inhabitants of Seir being displaced by the Edomites, the writer adds, 'As Israel *did* unto the land of his possession, which Jehovah gave unto them', clearly implying, that at the time when he wrote, the conquest of Canaan was already completed.

That the words refer to the land of Canaan, and not, as Scott contends, to the territory of Sihon and Og, seems plain; that the possession spoken of is a thing of the past, not of the future, as Hengstenberg argues, is equally so. The words were un-

* A similar use of the expression, in the mouth of future persons, and referring to future events, is to be found in Deut.vi.24.

questionably written after the conquest of Canaan. Are they, however, part of Moses' address? The passage runs thus, 'And Jehovah said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in war; for I will not give thee of their land for a possession, because I have given Ar unto the children of Lot for a possession. (The Enim abode therein formerly, a people great and many and lofty, as the Anakim; who also were accounted giants, as the Anakim; but the Moabites call them Enim. The Horim also abode in Seir formerly; but the children of Esau succeeded them, when they had exterminated them from before them, and abode in their stead; as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which Jehovah gave unto them.) Now rise up, and pass ye over the brook Zered' (*v.*9-13). It must be apparent to every one that these particulars concerning the ancient inhabitants of Moab and Edom are no part of Moses' narrative; the change of person and the lack of connexion both shew them to be an interpolation, and especially the manifest continuation of the original text in the 13th and following verses. Bishop Colenso himself describes them as a mere parenthetical interruption of the narrative. This being so, we cannot hesitate in ascribing them to the pen of some later writer, most probably the compiler of Moses' speeches, who, we have already seen reason to believe, wrote several years after his death. The words objected may well, therefore, be taken in their natural, literal meaning, since they are as certainly foreign to the original discourse, as they are certainly post-mosaic.

5. In Deut.x.9, it is said, 'Wherefore Levi *had* (lit. 'there *was* to Levi') no part nor inheritance with his brethren'; to have carried out properly the part of Moses, the Deuteronomist should have written, 'Wherefore Levi *shall have* no part with his brethren'. It is plain that he writes from a later state of things than that of Moses.

The tense here used (הָיָה) is unquestionably that generally known as the past; that it therefore necessarily refers to a past action by no means follows. Let any one turn to Deut.xxx., the

prophecy of restoration from captivity, certainly therefore future, even if written by Jeremiah, and what tense will he find employed throughout? Almost invariably this same *past* one. Nay, the very first word in the chapter is this identical הָיָה which Bishop Colenso tells us must mean 'was,' yet which he himself translates 'shall come to pass' (p.554), the only meaning in fact which the word will bear there. Other similar instances might easily be multiplied *ad libitum*. It is clear, then, that according to his own shewing, the word used *will* bear the meaning which he says it ought to, and the Deuteronomist *has* 'carried out properly the part of Moses' (see also next objection).

6. In Deut.xix.14, it is commanded, 'Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour's landmark, which *they of old time have set* in their inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that Jehovah thy God giveth thee to possess it';—the language of one writing long after the conquest and division of the land of Canaan.

The command is clearly one for the future, when the people had become settled in Canaan; the boundaries or landmarks referred to probably those of the former inhabitants of the land, which would fitly therefore be spoken of in the past. Even if the earlier boundaries of the Israelites be intended, Bishop Colenso admits that "the Hebrew would, probably, allow of the translation 'which they of old time *shall have* set,' &c."; the tense being the *same* as that in x.9 just considered! We heartily agree with him, that 'it would be unsafe to infer the later age of the Deuteronomist merely from such a text.'

7. Twice in Deuteronomy does the writer pass suddenly from speaking in his own person, to speaking in God's, xi.14-15,xxix.5-6; a sufficient proof of the real nature of the book, and its unhistorical character.

The latter of these is very easily accounted for. The first phrase, 'I have led you forty years,' may refer as naturally to Moses as to God; the second, 'that ye may know that I am Jehovah thy God,' merely introduces the well known seal of

authority (see p.125-6), and no more implies a real change of persons than the '*I am* hath sent me unto you' of Ex.iii.14. The other instance must remain a literary curiosity, for which no adequate explanation can be devised. How it can possibly serve to show the later origin, or unhistorical character of the book, it is hard to see. The difficulty is the same whenever the book was written; while it must be admitted, that such a change would be far more likely to be made in a *spoken* address,—when a slight alteration of tone or gesture might make all plain,—than in a *written* one. Such sudden transitions are common in the Psalms and Prophets (*e.g.* Ps.xxxii.7-11,xlvi.8-11,lxxxi.5-16, lxxxii.6-8, lxxxix.1-5, xci.,cv.14-6, cxxxii.11-8, Is.xiii.9-13, xxvii. 1-6,xxxiv.2-6,xl.22-31,xlviii.12-6,li.9-20, &c.&c.); are these then all of later origin, all forgeries?

8. On several occasions the word בְּעֵבֶר 'beyond', 'on the other side', is used in Deuteronomy for the *eastern* side of Jordan (i.1,5,iii.8,iv.41, 46,47); implying therefore that the writer was upon the western; that is, that the book cannot have been written until after the passage of the Jordan.*

Five of the instances referred to (i.1,5,iv.41,46,47) are in narrative sections, the work of the compiler, written therefore very probably on the western side of Jordan. There remains but one instance, in which Moses himself thus designates the eastern bank. But there are also three instances in which he uses precisely the same word of the *western* bank, iii.20,25,xi.30. Now if his speaking of the *east* side as 'beyond' Jordan (assuming for the moment that the word is correctly rendered) proves that he cannot have written his book on that side, it is clear that in like manner his speaking of the *west* side as also 'beyond' Jordan proves that he cannot have written it on *that* side; and so the conclusion would be forced upon us, that he did not write

* Allusion is also made to the 'beyond Jordan' in Gen.l.11, but as it is here quite uncertain *which* side was the scene of the transaction spoken of, it seems unnecessary to discuss it.

it on *either side*, except indeed it be imagined that he *crossed* sides occasionally, and having begun his work and got so far as iii.8 on the west side, he then went over and wrote v.20,25, together with xi.30, on the east. It must be clear to every one, that a word so used cannot really determine *which* side is meant, and should be rendered simply 'beside' or 'on the side'. That this is really the case may be further shewn by the following considerations. (1.) The book of Joshua displays the same phenomena; בְּעֵבֶר occurs here 10 times, 9 times of the eastern bank, once (xii.7) of the western; which, it is to be observed, is the only occasion in the whole book, where the western side is designated by any word of the kind. (2.) The word which is generally regarded as the complement to בְּעֵבֶר, viz. מֵעֵבֶר, is again equally ambiguous. It occurs in Nu.xxxii.19, of *both* banks, and three times besides of the eastern; also four times in Joshua of the eastern; whereas, according to the theory now before us, it ought in all these cases to have been confined to the *western*. (3.) The etymology of the two words lends no support to the distinction. They are compounded of the noun עֵבֶר, 'side', with the prepositional prefixes בְּ 'in', and מִ 'from', words clearly incapable of fixing which side is intended. If anything, we might suppose that 'from the side' should be farther off, than 'in the side'; modern criticism has taken directly the opposite view.*

9. In Deut.xi.30, the position of Mounts Gerizim and Ebal are defined as 'on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champaign over against *Gilgal*, besides the plains of Moreh'; yet how should Moses know these localities, who had never been there?—how most of all should he be acquainted with *Gilgal*, which did not receive its name until after the passage of the Jordan (Josh.v.9)?

* It may be noticed that De Wette, who at one time urged this very objection, has in his *version* invariably followed the natural sense as deduced from the context, &c. in translating these two words.

Without entering into the full discussion of the various Gilgals mentioned in Scripture, and their identification, it will be sufficient for our purpose to notice, that there were in the days of Joshua, certainly *two* Gilgals; one named by himself on the occasion of the circumcising the people (v.9), the other a royal city or district conquered by him (xii.23). The position of this latter is doubtful, and must remain so; whichever place we identify it with, however, whether the Kilkulia (according to some 'Gilgoul') 6 miles north of Antipatris, or the Jiljuleh south-east of Kefr-Saba, or the Jiljilia south of Nabloûs, it was certainly in the neighbourhood of Mounts Gerizzim and Ebal, a place of note at the time, and known before Joshua. When, then, we read of a Gilgal, 'over against' which lay the plain country of the Canaanites surrounding those mountains, mentioned as a notable place before the conquest, which of these two shall we identify it with? Surely reason tells us plainly, with the royal city, not with the Israelitish camp.* By what strange and supernatural means Moses, who had been trained in Pharaoh's court, and was conversant with all the learning of that commercial nation, and the Israelites, whose fathers had carried on trade and established cities in Canaan even before the Exodus,† and who had been holding continual intercourse with the neighbouring nations,—by what strange and supernatural means Moses and his Israelites attained to the vast geographical knowledge required to set

---

* The objections which Bishop Colenso makes to this identification, are the superior fame of the Jordanic Gilgal, and the presence in Deut.xi.30 of the *article*, הַגִּלְגָּל, 'the Gilgal', as in all other places, *except* Josh.xii.23. To assume that the Deuteronomist intended the Gilgal by Jordan, on account of its greater fame after the conquest, is to assume his later date at once, and beg the whole question at issue. To use the mention of a place thus identified, as an *argument* for later date, is reasoning in a circle. The article is omitted in Josh.xii.23 no doubt on account of the prefixed preposition לְ, which almost invariably displaces the article, otherwise present and required.

† See this point well worked out in Dr. Benisch's Critical Examination of Bishop Colenso's Objections, Pt.I,p.62-4.

forth and appreciate such an elaborate description of the site of Ebal and Gerizzim as that in the text, we really cannot say. It may be well however to parallel the question by another, that we may shew that the difficulty, at all events, is not all on one side. Why was it that Jeremiah, when desirous of speaking to the Jews of his day about these two familiar mountains, thought it necessary to describe their situation so accurately, by the mention of a people all but extinct, a city 25 miles off, and a tract of country whose name had long since become obsolete?

10. In Deut.iii.9 the Canaanitish names of Mount Hermon are given, 'Which Hermon the Sidonians call Sirion, and the Amorites call it Shenir'; but what could Moses or his Israelites have known of these?

We might reply to this in the same way as to the last objection, about Moses' supposed ignorance of the land of Canaan. Most probably, however, the verse is a later addition of the compiler's, it being very unlikely that Moses should pause in the midst of his address to make such an observation (comp. pp.262, 4,72). We have a further note concerning this same Hermon in iv.48 (non-mosaic). By what means Jeremiah was likely to obtain information as to these ancient names, we leave Bishop Colenso to determine.

11. Moses is represented as closing his account of their journeys in the desert by saying, 'So we abode in the valley over against Beth-peor' (iii.29), when according to iv.46 the address itself was delivered there. It is clearly a note of place of a much later writer.

The statement in iv.46 refers much more naturally to the following address, than the preceding (see especially iv.44-5,comp.v.1). They probably sojourned in this glen on more than one occasion during the last 2-3 months, since it is mentioned in Nu.xxi.20 as the last station before the conquest of Sihon and Og, here as one occupied after that conquest was completed; they may have moved again before this address was delivered; though there really would be no difficulty in supposing them still there,

especially as the tense used is the present. The general question, of the probability of such recent events being thus narrated at length, will come before us in the next objection.

12. Transactions which had happened within the last few weeks, and with which his audience must have been perfectly familiar, are detailed at full length, just as if they were events *long past*. See Deut.i.-iii., and especially the account of the conquest of Sihon and Og.

Deut.ii.-iii. are certainly occupied with a minute recital of the events of the past six months. On what grounds, however, Bishop Colenso bases his opinion, that they are referred to as 'events *long past*' we really cannot see. Events of the past must be narrated as past, whether they belong to the previous century, or the previous week.* While that the speaker was fully aware of the late occurrence of the events detailed, is evident from such notes of time as ii.14,iv.3-4,38. Let us just consider the circumstances of the case. Moses was about taking his leave of the people, whom he had led and governed now these forty years; he had fondly hoped to be their leader still, even into the promised land, but his hopes were frustrated; yet had God vouchsafed to him to see one rich and fertile tract of country conquered and possessed. He gloried in the victories with which Almighty power had crowned their arms; every detail of that recent war was precious in his eyes, as every little movement of a modern campaign would be to the successful general who had conducted it. The newness of the occurrences did but add freshness to his feelings, and he was stirred by the thought of these latest deeds and blessings, far more than by the memory of those greater but long bygone glories which signalized the Exodus. How often during those years of weary

* In point of fact it is the *present* tense which is used throughout these chapters. This is, however, so commonly employed in narratives of past actions, that its use here cannot be insisted upon as a sign of the date when the events took place.

wandering had he reminded the people of these, and roused their faith and courage by the recital of Jehovah's mighty acts of old. The story was familiar to their ears, and use had worn off somewhat of its poignancy and power. Here was something new, something which they had seen with their own eyes not many weeks ago. Recent mercies ever prove the strongest incentives to gratitude, the firmest ground of faith. He would remind the people, then, of God's latest deeds on their behalf, not because they had forgotten, or were likely to forget them, but because these were most likely to kindle in their hearts that confidence and love, which he sought so earnestly to implant there. Israel was about entering upon a new and arduous trial; they had had to *suffer*, now they were called upon to *do*, and Moses' own experience told him that these were very different things, and required different powers to accomplish them. He first of all directs them back to that former period, when also they had been called upon to do, and points them to their double failure then, from faithlessness and from presumption. He shews them how not *all* the nations round about were doomed to be displaced before them; and then proceeds to narrate at length the glorious beginning of their conquest in the very lands where now they stood. He would have them take this first success as an earnest of the future, a pledge of God's assistance if only they continued faithful, firm, and humble. The inhabitants of Canaan were strong and warlike, their towns high-walled and strongly barred; but had not the Amorites on this side Jordan, and their towns, been the same? and they were conquered. To produce a strong impression with any story *details* are essential. Had Moses only told the people, that God had given Sihon and Og into their hands, and so he would do with all the other Canaanitish nations, but little would have been the effect upon their minds. No, he would have them remember all the circumstances of the contest, the strength and number of their foes, the fortifications of their cities, the utter destruction that had befallen them, the spoil

secured, the inheritance allotted, that so in all things he might shew them what their future lot should be, when he was gone, and the great struggle had begun. Surely, a more appropriate subject of discourse, a more natural mode of treatment, at such a time and for such a purpose, cannot be conceived. What purpose Jeremiah, or any other later writer, could have had in fabricating such an address, for the use of the people of his own times, we leave for more fertile imaginations to divine.

13. In Deut.iii.11 various particulars are recorded concerning Og and his iron bedstead, and especially its being *at that time* in Rabbah of the children of Ammon, which it seems impossible to believe were written by Moses, since Og had only just been conquered.

Several hypotheses have been devised to account for Og's bedstead being at Rabbah in the days of Moses; *e.g.* that he had sent it there for safety, or that it had been captured by the Ammonites in some previous war. The latter is certainly the more probable, since both Sihon and Og appear to have only recently conquered their lands from Moab and Ammon (Nu.xxi. 26, Jud.xi.13 &c.). This, however, is a matter of small importance, since there can be little doubt, but that the entire verse is an addition of the compiler's, appended by way of note just like ii.10-2,20-3,iii.14, all in the same address, and all distinguished like this, as interruptions of the original text.*

14. Little pieces of information about the ancient history of the land of Canaan, and other archæological notices, are given in Deuteronomy, which awkwardly interrupt the course of the narrative, and certainly could never have been introduced by Moses himself; *e.g.* i.1-2,ii.10-12, 20-23.

The last two have been already noticed as unmistakeable interpolations from the pen of the later compiler; the first occurs in the introduction to the book, also from the same source.

---

* All these sections, save one (iii.14), are enclosed in parentheses in De Wette's version.

Their post-mosiac character may, therefore, be admitted at once. How a note of distance like that in i.2 can 'interrupt awkwardly the course of the narrative', which begins four verses afterwards, it is hard to see.*

15. The way in which the Deuteronomist speaks of Edom, Moab and Ammon, all as independent and powerful kingdoms (Deut.ii.4-5,9, 19,xxiii.3-6), shews that he must have lived in the later times of the monarchy and not the earlier, when these countries were tributary to Israel (comp.Jer.ix.26,xxv.21,xxvii.3,xl.14,xlviii.,xlix.1-22). Egypt also is mentioned as a comparatively friendly power (xxiii.7), agreeably to Jer.ii.18,36,xlii.7.

No doubt, if we were *certain* that Deuteronomy was written at some time during the Hebrew monarchy, these particulars concerning the neighbouring nations would tend to fix it as written in its later rather than its earlier days. So far as we have gone at present, however, all the evidence has tended the other way, and the time of *Moses* seems in all respects the most probable for its composition. The signs of time here set forth will help to establish this still further. The subjugation of Edom, Moab and Ammon to the yoke of Israel, forbidden for the time in Deuteronomy, is distinctly predicted in Is.xi.14,xxv.10 (comp.

* The first two verses of Deuteronomy do certainly involve a difficulty, though not that mentioned either by Bishop Colenso, or by his favourite authority Knobel. They read as follows. 'These are the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beside Jordan in the desert, in the plain (lit. 'Arabah') over against the Red [sea], between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Dizahab; eleven days' from Horeb on the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-barnea'. The place thus designated is manifestly the Wady el Arabah, running from Akabah up to Akrabbim, with which also the distance named well agrees (see Hist. Charact. Pent. p.121 note, also p.195 § 50). The verses immediately following tell us, however, that it was 'in the land of Moab' that Moses delivered his first address, the same is said also of the second (iv.46), and again of one of the last (xxix.1). We can only suppose that we have not the addresses in chronological order, and that some part of what now appears to be a consecutive address in chap.v.-xxiv. was delivered at this earlier stage of their sojournings.

also xv.-vi.,xxxiv.,Jer.xlviii.-ix.22,Amos,i.11-5,ii.1-3); a writer of still later date was not likely to forbid it. This would bring down the book of Deuteronomy, as certainly earlier than the reign of David, when their subjugation was actually effected (2Sam.viii.2,14,xi.1,xii.26-31). But in truth, these expressions concerning Edom, Moab, and Ammon are no signs of later date whatever, since they were all unquestionably powerful and independent kingdoms in the days of Moses, and the Israelites certainly did not at that time interfere with their territory. So too with Egypt; as before observed* the people of Egypt generally appear to have been friendly towards the Israelites, individuals from among them who sojourned with Israel might well therefore be treated favourably. Lastly, there is another foreign nation mentioned in Deuteronomy—Amalek; also spoken of as an independent and powerful nation, and one whose extirpation is enjoined upon Israel as a sacred duty. Of this nation Bishop Colenso admits that 'we hear nothing in the history of the later kings': he might have added, or in the *prophets* either, not even Jeremiah. Many are their lists of foreign enemies (see especially Jer.xxv.19-26,xlvi.-li.,Ezek.xxxii.), many their denunciations against them; yet Amalek is never mentioned. Can there be stronger proof that Amalek's power to hurt, and even national existence, was at an end? But if so, then Deuteronomy, with its command to exterminate Amalek, must belong to an earlier period. All that Bishop Colenso has to say on this point is, that 'They may have survived as a people down to the days of the Deuteronomist, [*i.e.* of Jeremiah] though, perhaps, they existed in his time as a small and inconsiderable tribe, dwindling away to nothing'. The foundation for this supposition he does not tell us. The latest mention of Amalek is in Ps.lxxxiii.7, a Psalm he says 'written apparently in David's time'.

---

* See Hist. Charact. Pent. pp.39-41,77-8,186.

16. *Iron* is mentioned familiarly in several places in Deuteronomy (iv.20,viii.9,xix.5,xxviii.23,48), and this in regard to an age, preceding that of Homer by about five centuries.

That iron was known and used in the days of Homer there can be no doubt; that it was first discovered then we have no reason to believe. On the contrary, there is strong evidence to shew that it was known much earlier, and was used in Egypt (and if there, then certainly in other places also, for it was not one of her native manufactures) long before the days of Moses.* Iron was worked in Palestine in the country of the Lebanon.

17. The law concerning war in Deut.xx.1-9 is plainly the work of a later writer, since it speaks of building houses, and planting vineyards (*v.*5-6), and cannot therefore apply to the wars of conquest in which the people would be necessarily engaged for some years after the law was (supposed to be) given.

The law certainly refers especially to the future, and itself clearly indicates that it does so. For after the regulations concerning battles (all couched, as is observed, in general terms), we have the clause concerning sieges (*v.*10-4) still in the same general terms, which yet is defined immediately afterwards (*v.*15-6), as referring only to cities 'very far off', and not to Canaan at all. It is most reasonable to suppose that the whole law had a similar reference; especially as both the preceding and following chapters consist in like manner of laws to be observed when the people were finally settled, but not before.

18. The Deuteronomist especially forbids the worship of the sun, and moon, and all the host of heaven (iv.19,xvii.3), which is not mentioned in the earlier books, but which is frequently alluded to in Jeremiah (vii.17-8,viii.2,xix.13,xliv.17-9,25). It appears to have become common in Judah first in the reign of Manasseh (2Kings, xxi.3,5), but to have been put down by Josiah (xxiii.4-5,11).

This again is merely a *relative* sign of time. If the book was

* See Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, ii.p.153-5.

written in the times of the monarchy at all, then this mention of sun-worship &c. might render the later times somewhat the more probable. As an *absolute* sign of time it is worthless. It is admitted that the sun was 'an object of worship in early days among the tribes of Canaan'. It would seem to have been so also among the eastern nations generally (comp.Job,xxxi.26-7). It certainly was so in Chaldea and *Egypt*.* There was clearly, therefore, quite as much reason for prohibiting it in Moses' days as in Jeremiah's. The clause in the second commandment, 'that is in *heaven above*', certainly referred to such practices, images being all but invariably employed in this worship. The fact of the complete phrase 'the sun and the moon and all the host of heaven' occurring only in Deut.iv.19,xvii.3,Jer.viii.2, and 2Kings,xxiii.5, is certainly but a poor argument for later origin, or Jeremiah's authorship. Had it been a favourite phrase with him we should have expected it a little oftener than once. How comes it, too, that 'Queen of Heaven', which occurs so frequently with him (vii.18,xliv.17,18,19,25), is not once found in Deuteronomy!†

19. It is enacted in Deuteronomy that all matters of controversy or judgment should be referred to 'the Priests the Levites, and unto the Judge that shall be in those days' (xvii.8-13,xix.17-8,xxi.5 &c.). Such a law clearly could not have been made in the days of David or Solomon, or any of the more powerful kings, who were themselves the supreme judges, but must be referred to the later days of the monarchy, and especially to the time of Josiah, whose tender age must have rendered the Priests persons of considerable consequence.

Another purely relative sign of time. We might rather say

---

* See Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies i.,p.156-79; and Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians i.,p.328,331.

† Another heathen custom forbidden by the Deuteronomist, that of prostitution in religious worship (xxiii.17-8), is also admitted to have been common 'among the Aramæan tribes', and to have been prohibited, probably, on account of the 'vicious practices committed with the daughters of Moab' recorded in Nu.xxv.

that the absence of any mention of the king in these judicial laws is a proof that they were written at a time when there was no king, nor any prospect of one, but merely the Priests, and the civil or military leaders, whom God raised up to act as Judges of the people, with of course their subordinate elders and bailiffs, according to Moses' original institution (Ex.xviii.25-6, Deut.i.15-7); which is clearly implied in the fact, that only things 'too hard for judgment' were to be thus carried up to the supreme authorities (xvii.8, comp.xvi.18-9). The kings merely succeeded to this office of principal judge, which had been held by the other leaders of the people before them.

20. Regulations are laid down in Deut.xvii.14-7 concerning the choice and duties of a *king* (comp. also xxviii.36). This law clearly could not have existed in the days of Samuel, who not only did not allude to its existence when the people asked for a king, but who severely rebuked them for doing so, as a grievous sin, a rejection of Jehovah (1Sam.viii.7,xii.17-9).

We have already had ample proof that Deuteronomy must have existed before the times of the Hebrew monarchy, and need not therefore be much alarmed at this seeming incongruity. The law, it will be observed, does not recommend or directly sanction the appointment of a king, but merely provides for a case which mere human foresight would tell the law-giver was almost certain to occur. Whether known to Samuel and the people or not, its provisions were certainly observed; for the king was chosen from among the Israelites themselves, and by special message from God, publicly confirmed by solemn lot. We read also that Samuel instructed the people in the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a book (1Sam.x.25). Nor did the sin of the people consist simply in wishing for a king, as if monarchy were in itself an evil thing; the fact that God granted their request, not only for a time, but for ever, in the appointment of David and his seed to the throne (comp.Jer.xxxiii.17, 21,25-6 &c.), demonstrates the contrary. The sin of the people

lay in their want of faith in God's mercy and providence to raise them up such leaders as they needed, in their dependence upon human help, and in their not referring the matter to God for approval. Thus it was that asking them a king became to them a grievous sin. Had the request been made from pure patriotic motives, and with due submission to the Divine will, it would most surely have been praised not blamed. The fact of Moses mentioning the 'king whom they should raise over them' in his prophecy of their captivity (xxviii.36), is surely to be regarded rather as a proof of his inspiration, than a sign of later date. Had he spoken merely in the strength of human wisdom and foresight it certainly would have been a strange thing for him to mention. The address in which this prophecy occurs was manifestly intended for *all time*, not merely for the people whom he then addressed.

21. In the days of David and Solomon the title כֹּהֵן 'priest' was applied to a variety of civil and other officers (see 2Sam.viii.18,xx.26, 1Kings,iv.2,5,1Chron.xxvii.5); in later times it was confined to those exercising sacerdotal functions. So also in Deuteronomy, which must hence be assigned to the later days of the Hebrew monarchy.

The test of date here proposed is clearly as applicable to Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers as to Deuteronomy, the logical conclusion to be deduced from it the same. But in all of these the application of כֹּהֵן exclusively to *priests* is as marked as in Deuteronomy. According to Bishop Colenso's own argument, then, none of these can have been written in the days of David and Solomon. And yet to the days of David and Solomon does he ascribe them! We admit the justice of the sign of time proposed, and willingly accept the conclusion to be deduced from it, that *no part* of the Pentateuch was composed at the time referred to. It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the alternative is still left open, as to *which* side of that period they belong to, whether before or after. The result

of our inquiries so far leads us unhesitatingly to prefer the former.

22. In Deut. iv. 25-31, xxviii., xxix. 22-9, xxx. 1-9, xxxii. 35-43 &c., large mention is made of the captivity of the people, and their future restoration, in terms which plainly refer to the calamities of the Ten Tribes, and seem to point the people of Judah to these by way of warning.

This objection is of worth only, as Bishop Colenso admits, on the assumption 'that these words were not spoken by Moses prophetically, with a view to *future* events'. But they expressly claim to be prophetic, to refer to the far distant future, and not in any sense to the present, still less to the past. As such, then, we are bound by all sound principles of criticism to regard them, at all events until some very powerful and conclusive evidence of later origin and fabrication is adduced. None such has yet appeared. Regarding these words as prophecies, they are clearly as appropriate in Moses' days as afterwards. There is nothing in them which seems to belong exclusively or even primarily to the Ten Tribes as distinguished from the Two. Such a distinction is indeed utterly foreign to the whole tone and spirit of the Deuteronomist. He everywhere speaks of Israel as a single nation,—they should 'utterly perish from off the land' (*i.e.* clearly, all of them), they should be 'scattered among the nations', and be 'left few in number', where they should 'serve gods, the work of men's hands' (iv. 26-8); all which came true of Judah in the days of Nebuchadnezzar, as much as of Israel in those of Shalmanezer. The nation of 'fierce countenance', 'whose tongue they should not understand' (xxviii. 49-50), assuredly referred as well to Chaldea as Assyria; the 'straitness' of the siege (*v.* 53-56) as much to Jerusalem as to Samaria; the promised restoration, still to both. Had such a would-be-prophecy been written in the days of Josiah, it is surely scarcely possible, but that some hint of Israel's divided

state should have been given. Jeremiah teems with such allusions.*

23. The directions given in Deut.xxvii.11-26, concerning the blessing and cursing upon Mounts Gerizzim and Ebal, were plainly never intended to be carried out in practice; the whole transaction was only an ideal scene, which the author himself scarcely realized, and which could not therefore have been commanded by Moses. The tribe of Levi are first appointed to stand on Gerizzim with the other *blessing* tribes (*v.*12), then immediately afterwards it is said that the Levites should pronounce the *curses* (*v.*14). So, too, no blessings whatever are recorded parallel with the cursings in *v.*15-26, but the writer is carried away by his subject and goes off into the magnificent exhortation in chap.xxviii.

There certainly is some difficulty in comprehending exactly how the ceremony here detailed was intended to be performed, arising probably from some of the instructions having been omitted. It is to be observed, however, that two exactly parallel series of blessings and cursings *are* recorded in xxviii.3-6,16-9, which we may regard as probably those to be pronounced by the tribes, and on which the whole of Moses' address hangs by way of commentary. The way in which the ceremony was performed was probably therefore something as follows. The Levites in the centre first pronounced the curses in xxvii.15-26, which contained a summary of the chief outward sins forbidden in the ten commandments, the people confirming each with an 'Amen'. Then some such introductory statement as that in xxviii.1-2 was made by the Levites, and the six tribes on Mount Gerizzim responded with the blessings of *v.*3-6; a similar introductory statement with respect to the curses (*v.*15), and then these repeated in like manner by the six tribes on Mount Ebal (*v.*16-9). The difficulty about the tribe of Levi is easily solved, those in the centre were the ministering Levites, about 8-9000 men; those on Mount Gerizzim the tribe at large, probably

* See iii.6-18,v.11,xi.10,17,xiii.11,xxiii.6,xxx.3,4,xxxi.27,31,xxxii. 30,32,xxxiii.7,14 &c.

nearly as many more.* We have in Josh.viii.33-5 an account of the actual performance of this ceremony, of the date of which we shall have to speak at length in the next chapter. (For further notes on the passage here before us see Append. No.3.)

24. Mention is made in Deut.xxviii.58,61,xxix.20,21,27, of the 'book of this Law' and the 'words', 'plagues', 'curses' &c., which were 'written' in it, when yet the addresses referred to were not finished, and of course before they could have been written.

All this proceeds upon the assumption that the addresses in question were committed to writing *after* their delivery; but why may they not have been written first, and then delivered? The fact that the elders and 'the Priests the Levites' were joined with Moses in making one at least of them known to the people (xxvii.1,9), seems to show that it must have been so. All difficulty is thus at once removed. It was doubtless from these documents, written either by Moses himself, or at his dictation, that the editor of Deuteronomy compiled his work, inserting such notes, and pieces of connecting and explanatory narrative, as he deemed necessary for their right understanding.

25. The description which is given in Deut.xii.8,xxxii.15-8 of the state of Israel at the time,—every man doing what was right in his own eyes, the people waxen fat, forsaking God, and provoking him to jealousy with idols and abominations,—is wholly inapplicable to any conceivable condition of the people of Israel in the plains of Moab, but corresponds thoroughly with the state of things in the reign of Josiah.

The description in the song of Moses (xxxii.15-8) was unquestionably intended to refer chiefly to the future, the whole song

* The additional note in Josh.viii.33, 'the Priests the Levites *which bare the ark*', may perhaps be meant to limit these central Levites to the Kohathites (2-3000); but it is more probable that all the ministering Levites were included. For remarks as to the possibility of the people hearing the blessings and curses, see Hist. Charact. Pent. p.114-5.

being avowedly prophetical (xxxi.16-21,28-30). They would, however, apply only too aptly to Israel's condition even then. The whoredoms and idolatries of these very plains of Moab, the continual murmuring and rebellion of the people, were certainly sufficient to justify expressions quite as strong as any of those here objected to. That the people in the wilderness, even 'with Moses himself in their midst', did not observe the laws declared to them, and did not respect as they ought the Tabernacle-service, seems clear from the whole tenor of the narrative.* That he had previously enacted laws, which *if observed* would have rendered such a statement as that in Deut.xii.8 unnecessary and inconsistent, is certainly no ground for rejecting the statement itself as untrue, except it can be shewn on independent grounds that the laws in question *were* observed. This is not attempted to be done; but silence is taken as a sign of observance. In the later history it is everywhere urged as a sign of *non-observance*. But circumstances alter cases.

26. The blessing of Moses (Deut.xxxiii.) presents many signs of later date. (*a*) The expression in *v.*4 'Moses commanded *us* a law' &c., could not plainly have been written by Moses himself. (*b*) Reuben is spoken of as few in number, Simeon as altogether extinct (*v.*6), as was certainly the case in the later days of the monarchy. (*c*) Judah is represented as in distress, and the prayer is made 'bring him unto his people, (*v.*7), referring doubtless to the captivity of the Ten Tribes, and the writer's desire for their restoration into one kingdom (Jer. xxx.3-9,xxxi.,xxxiii.&c). (*d*) Levi is highly praised, and evidently occupied a prominent position, although sorely tried and tempted (*v.*8-11), again agreeing with the words of Jeremiah (xxxi.14,xxxiii. 18,20-2). (*e*) Benjamin is mentioned next in order, before Joseph, as part of the kingdom of Judah (comp.Jer.xvii.26,xxxii.44,xxxiii.13), between whose shoulders also Jehovah was to dwell (*v.*12), *i.e.* at Jerusalem, which lay about the middle of his southern boundary. (*f*) Joseph is largely blessed (*v.*13-7), in imitation of Gen.xlix.22-6, probably again with the thought of future restoration chiefly in view (comp.Jer.xxxi.1-4,6,8-9,11-2).

The fact that the blessing of Moses was recorded in its present

* See Hist. Charact. Pent. p.150-1.

form by a later hand has been already insisted on (p.156). It would seem, also, as Kurtz suggests, that it was written down from *memory*, not copied from original documents like the other parts of Deuteronomy, to which doubtless the frequent recurrence of the phrase, 'he said' (*v.*2,7,8,12,13,18,20,22,23,24), and other peculiarities, are to be ascribed. With respect to the particular blessings predicted, we may observe, that if Mosaic they would most probably refer to the fortunes of the tribes on their settlement in the land of Canaan, the subject immediately before the speaker's mind. Far distant destinies would be less likely to find place here, than in the blessing of Jacob, where no point of present interest presented itself, in which the tribes would differ from one another. Let us examine the blessing of Moses from this point of view.

Of Reuben's deeds in later days we know nothing, except his vacillation and sluggishness in the war with Jabin and Sisera (Jud.v.15-6). His tribe was clearly not a leading or important one; no judge ever arose from it; but given up to pastoral employments, and on the frontier of Israel, it is highly probable that both in numbers and strength they rapidly declined, even as Moses implied when he said 'Let Reuben live and not die, and let his men not be few' (*v.*6). Simeon's omission has been commented upon before.* The sentence of dispersion pronounced against him by Jacob (Gen.xlix.7), was not as in the case of Levi turned into a blessing, but was carried out in the allotment of inheritance, Simeon being appointed to dwell among the children of Judah, not in any distinct possession of his own (Josh.xix.1-9). Nothing is recorded of him in the history of the Judges, beyond his assisting Judah in some of the earlier wars (Jud.i.3,17).

Thus far no marked characteristics have presented themselves, from which to conclude with certainty the date of these predic-

* Hist. Charact. Pent. p.181, § 12.

tions. The next tribe, however, supplies us with a very striking one. 'Hear, Jehovah the voice of Judah, and bring him unto his people; let his hands be numerous for him, and be thou an help from his adversaries' (*v.*7). The inheritance of Judah was too large for him (Josh.xix.9), the enemies who beset him were strong, their cities fortified; not until after Joshua's death were many of their strongholds captured (Jud.i.1-20). Much, then, did Judah need at this time 'numerous hands' and 'help from his adversaries'. But Judah was also the southernmost tribe, and much of this unconquered territory lay *between* him and the rest of Israel, and cut him off both from succour and from intercourse. This too was foreseen, and the appropriate petition put up, 'Hear, Jehovah, the voice of Judah, and *bring him to his people.*' To apply these words to the restoration of the Ten Tribes to Judah's sovereignty, is to reverse their meaning altogether. Judah had not seceded from Israel, but Israel from Judah; Judah had not been carried captive away from Israel, but Israel away from Judah. To restore the Ten Tribes would be, then, to 'bring *his people unto him*', not 'him unto his people'.

The blessing of Levi is also remarkable. It opens with a word of warning to the people generally, concerning the exclusive character of the priesthood and its gifts of divination. 'Thy Thummim and thy Urim (truth and light) belong to thy pious (or 'favoured') man', not to any one else.* Then follow three reminiscences of their desert life (*v.*8-9), the trying of Moses and Aaron (the 'pious men' of those days) at Massah (Ex.xvii. 1-7), the striving with them at Meribah (Nu.xx.1-13), and the devotion of the Levites generally to the 'covenant', even to the disowning of their kindred, exhibited in the matter of the golden

* This first clause seems clearly addressed to the *people*, not as is commonly understood to Jehovah; for that the people tried and strove with Moses and Aaron, is certain, that *God* did so nowhere appears.

calf (Ex.xxxii.26-9 comp.p.230). Allusion is also made at the end to enemies of Levi (*v.*11), perhaps another reminiscence of the desert, the rebellion of Dathan and Abiram (see p.232-4). That Moses should have thus referred to some of the most notable events in their recent experience is natural enough. That a later writer should have thus crowded his blessing with allusions to almost forgotten legends is most improbable. Levi was certainly as much distinguished in Moses' days, and the Priests as much honoured, as in any others.*

The blessing of Benjamin presents considerable difficulty. It runs thus, 'The beloved of Jehovah shall dwell in safety by him; he shall harbour him all the day long, and he shall dwell between his shoulders' (*v.*12). The ambiguity of the Hebrew leaves it doubtful, whether 'the beloved of Jehovah' (whoever may be meant by that expression) is to 'dwell in safety' *by Benjamin*, who is to protect him, and 'between whose shoulders' he is to dwell; or whether *Benjamin himself* is 'the beloved', who is to dwell by *Jehovah*, be protected by Him, and dwell 'between His shoulders'. The latter is perhaps the most probable view, since it is difficult to see *who* on the other view can be intended by 'the beloved'. If this be the case, then it doubtless refers to Benjamin's secure and central position among the tribes, with a small compacted territory, free from internal enemies, except just on the borders at Jerusalem (Jud.i.21), protected from invasion on every side, and dwelling as it were 'between the shoulders' of God's two great tribes, the leaders of his people, Judah and Ephraim (Josh.xviii.5,11). That this last expression refers to the position of the sanctuary (at Gibeon, according to Knobel, at Jerusalem, according to Bishop Colenso), is improbable; if it does, the sanctuary at Shiloh, which lay a little to the north of Benjamin, would suit the description almost as well.

* See Nu.xxvi.1,3,63,xxvii.2,xxxi.6,12,13,21,26,31,51,54,xxxii.28, xxxiv.17,Josh.xiv.1,xvii.4,xxi.1,xxii.13 &c.

The blessing of Joseph is admitted to be an obstacle in the way of Bishop Colenso's theory. It exceeds all the others in length and fulness, dwelling with manifest delight upon the fertility of his land (*v.*13-6), his deeds in conquest, and the number of his people (*v.*17). That such a blessing should have been composed after the rejection and captivity of the Ten Tribes is most improbable. Even if the first part of the blessing be left out of the account, as referring chiefly to the land, and following in the main the earlier blessing of Jacob (Gen.xlix.25-8), yet how are the allusions to the pre-eminence of Joseph above all the other tribes, his strength and success in war, his surpassing numbers, to be explained? Bishop Colenso says these are all 'delightful prophetic anticipations of the future reunion of Israel and Judah'. Where in the whole blessing he finds one single hint at 'reunion' at all, we are at a loss to perceive. The 'bringing of Judah to his people' we have already shewn is incapable of any such meaning. But let us notice for a moment the extreme inconsistency of this view. Bishop Colenso says the blessing cannot have been written in Samuel's time, because the state of the tribe of Levi *then present* did not accord with its declarations, although that of Judah and of Joseph did; again, it cannot have been written in David or Solomon's time, because the condition of Judah *then present* did not correspond, although that of Levi and (in a less degree) of Joseph did. In Jeremiah's time however he says it may have been written, because with that agree the sayings concerning Levi and Judah. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that this is so; yet those concerning Joseph differ most remarkably from the state of things then present. Now if the principle of Bishop Colenso's previous arguments be correct, and *one* discord is to be allowed more weight than *two* concords, why not apply it here also? The conclusion to be deduced, if it were so applied, is manifest,—the blessing cannot have been written in Jeremiah's time either. But here, forsooth, the hitherto ignored idea of *prophecy* is to come to the

rescue. The state of Joseph spoken of was dictated by 'prophetic hope'. Why, then, not also the state of Levi, or of Judah? and so the blessing be brought back to the days of Samuel or even earlier? The answer is very simple,—it does not suit Bishop Colenso's theory. But to return. It is said that 'there is absolutely *no* one time in the history of the people to which the different parts of the Blessing will apply'. This we unhesitatingly deny. There *is* a time to which they all apply, and that time is the period immediately succeeding the conquest of Canaan. The accordance of the blessings pronounced upon Reuben, Judah, Levi, and Benjamin, with the fortunes of these tribes at the period referred to, has been already pointed out; that presented by Joseph is equally marked. Joseph was by far the largest tribe (9,400 greater than Judah at the last muster, Nu.xxvi.22,comp.34,37), and had allotted to it at once the largest and most fertile portion of the land of Canaan. The leader of the people, Joshua, was of this tribe (Nu.xiii.8), from which also sprang many of the most distinguished of the later judges. It was for centuries the leading tribe (comp.Ps.lx.7, lxxviii.67,lxxx.2,lxxxi.5, &c.), and might well therefore merit the surpassing blessing pronounced upon it by Moses.*

* Two objections are taken by Bishop Colenso to the Mosaic origin of the blessing of Joseph. 1. It contains no mention of Ephraim's defection and captivity, which if prophetic it should. 2. Ephraim is spoken of as larger than Manasseh, whereas the contrary was at that time the case (Nu.xxvi.34,37). To this we may reply, 1. The prophetic character of the blessing by no means necessitates the *more distant* fortunes of the tribes being mentioned; in which case, indeed, nothing but *dispersion* could have been predicted of any of them. The horizon of nearly every prophecy is limited. What that limit is must be decided by its own contents, not by our notions of what was likely. The blessing of Moses in respect to Judah certainly did not extend to the times of the kingdom, that Joseph's should extend several centuries later still, was, therefore, most improbable. 2. Ephraim was the chief tribe, and may very soon have eclipsed Manasseh in Canaan, *to which the words referred.* Or they may be merely figurative, like the song of the maidens concerning Saul and David (1Sam.xviii.7), as expressive of precedence and superior dignity.

But few comments are made by Bishop Colenso on the remaining blessings, which are for the most part short, and closely parallel to those pronounced by Jacob. They all refer to the situation and fortunes of the tribes immediately after the conquest. Thus Zebulon is mentioned as engaged in commerce, Issachar as chiefly given to agriculture, both in the northern part of Canaan, in the neighbourhood of Tyre and Sidon, becoming rich from the treasures there accumulated, and drawing people into Judea to the Mountain of God's inheritance* (*v.*18-9, comp.Gen.xlix.13-5). Gad is specially signalized as a warlike and successful tribe, who 'saw the first part [given] to himself, that there was [his] portion from the lawgiver laid up', *i.e.* the territory of Sihon, the first-fruits of the conquest, assigned to him by Moses;†—but who 'came at the head of the people, and did the righteousness of Jehovah, and his judgments with Israel', *i.e.* proceeded over Jordan with Joshua, at the head of the other tribes, and fulfilled the covenant made with them by Moses. Dan is compared to a 'lion's whelp', that should 'leap from Bashan',—that is, should assail unexpectedly as a lion from out his lair;—in allusion no doubt to the sudden assault of Dan upon Laish (*v.*22,comp.Jud.xviii.). Napthali and Asher are mentioned as dwelling in fruitful districts, the former to the west and south of Dan (*v.*23), the latter in a country rich in metals, that is, Lebanon (*v.*24-5,comp.p.275). The conclusion of the whole blessing adds yet another proof, that the writer had in his eye throughout, a time when Israel should have conquered

---

* Without doubt the hill-country of Palestine, as in Ex.xv.17; not Mount Zion (as Bishop Colenso), or Carmel (as Knobel).

† So De Wette; 'because there is the portion set apart by the lawgiver', Benisch; 'because there, [in] a portion of the lawgiver, [was he] seated', E.V. Also in the latter clause of the verse, Benisch and E.V. read 'he came with the heads of the people'; 'at the head' (as above) De Wette; Heb. 'he came the head of the people'. Gad appears to have taken the lead among the two tribes and a half, rather than Reuben (comp.Nu.xxxii.2,6,25,29,33,34).

and displaced her enemies, and should dwell in safety in a land abounding with corn and wine, solitary and only blessed among the nations (*v.*26-9); such a time as most assuredly found place towards the end of Joshua's life, and during the rule of his immediate successors, ere Israel fell away to worship idols. To this time, as we have seen, all the blessings refer, in this they find their apt fulfilment, as they do in no other later period. A powerful argument is thus obtained for the early origin of the blessing as a whole. Admit it but to be prophetic, and its true Mosaic character is established beyond a doubt.

27. The account of the death of Moses in Deut.xxxiv. could not have been written by himself. It also contains references to the positions of the various tribes, including the far northern Dan (formerly Laish, see p.95), which shew that the writer lived, not only after the days of Moses, but also after those of Joshua.

The late origin of this chapter has been already remarked upon (p.156); it was probably written shortly after Joshua's death. There is, however, another sign of time in this chapter, of great importance, which Bishop Colenso has altogether overlooked,—its closing words, 'And there arose not a prophet *since* in Israel *like unto Moses*, whom Jehovah knew face to face; in all the signs and the wonders, which Jehovah sent him to do in the land of Egypt to Pharaoh, and to all his servants, and to all his land; and in all that strong hand, and in all that great terribleness, which Moses shewed before the eyes of all Israel' (*v.*10-12). Bishop Colenso regards these words as due to the Deuteronomist, to *him* therefore their date would be conclusive as to the matter of authorship. To us it will simply shew the date of compilation, the addresses themselves being of course still earlier. Two things, it will be observed, are here insisted upon,—knowing God face to face, and being mighty in signs and wonders. The writer asserts that in *his* day no prophet had arisen like Moses in these two respects. Is there then any period in Jewish history, *after* which it would have been impos-

sible for such words to have been written? We answer unhesitatingly, there is. Was not ELIJAH a prophet like unto Moses?—he who shut and opened heaven with his word; who raised the widow's son to life; who brought down fire upon his sacrifice; who went for forty days and nights without food, who climbed the heights of Sinai, and there held awful intercourse with God, beheld the tokens of his presence, heard his voice; who prophesied of Ahab's, Jezebel's and Ahaziah's deaths; who brought down fire again upon his enemies, and swept them from him to a swift destruction; who with his mantle cleft the Jordan, and then in flaming whirlwind rode triumphantly to heaven;—he whose name was echoed back by the last prophet, Malachi, as the appointed forerunner of Jehovah's last great day, to whom *with Moses* all the people were to have regard, that they might be prepared for that dread coming (Mal.iv.4-6);—he who stood, still side by side with *Moses*, on the holy mount, and spake to Jesus there of His decease, joint witnesses to Him;—was *he* not a 'prophet like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face; in signs and wonders, in a strong hand and great terribleness'? Surely no writer living after his day, still less the narrator (as is supposed) of his mighty deeds, could have dared to say, with him before his eyes,—'there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses'. The concluding chapter of the Pentateuch must clearly have been written before the reign of Ahab.

But we may go back further yet. Was not SAMUEL a prophet like unto Moses?—He too is placed beside him by the sacred writers (Ps.xcix.6,Jer.xv.1), as if on an equality; he too communed with Jehovah face to face, and heard his voice even when a little child; to him was the rare gift of 'open vision' granted, which won for him the title of the 'seer' (p.100); to him did all the people go for counsel and instruction; he stood before them as their mediator, their lawgiver, and their judge; he shewed them mighty signs from heaven; made and unmade their

kings. Less brilliant perhaps in deed, because his lot was cast in different times, yet endowed with all the powers, possessed of all the privileges, of Moses and Elijah; the last of Israel's judges, the first of her great prophets;—was he not like unto Moses? Except the words were written by himself (of which we have no evidence), we can scarcely imagine any writer of his or any later day writing thus of Moses, and forgetting Samuel. There is thus little room for doubt, but that the book of Deuteronomy was finished, ere yet a king had sat on Israel's throne.

Many other signs of time, all tending to the same conclusion, have been brought to light in the course of our inquiries, both in the present chapter, and the preceding. Others of a similar kind might easily be multiplied. It must suffice, however, to select a few of the more prominent, and then pass on to further, and if possible yet more conclusive, evidence to the same end.

1. The book of Deuteronomy abounds, as we have seen, with allusions to the history of the children of Israel in the wilderness (see pp. 163,211-9,284-5, &c.), it also contains in chap. i.-iii. a detailed and consecutive history of the journey from Horeb to the plains of Moab. The propriety of such allusions and such history in the mouth of Moses, and their inappropriateness in the mouth of a later prophet, writing, as Bishop Colenso so repeatedly tells us, for the exclusive benefit of his own times, have been abundantly enforced. The argument may be put, however, in a stronger light yet. Some of the events thus spoken of are distinctly asserted to have been recent, and witnessed by those to whom the words were addressed. Deut.iv.3-4 '*Your eyes have seen* what Jehovah did because of Baal-peor; for every man that went after Baal-peor, Jehovah thy God hath exterminated him from among you. But ye that did cleave unto Jehovah your God are alive all of you *this day*'. These words clearly could only have been spoken with truth by some one contemporaneous with the event referred to. The expression 'this day' must either be a

genuine sign of time, a proof that the address in question is Mosaic, or a deliberate falsehood. If 'unto this day', and 'as it is this day' are to be pressed as signs of time (as we have seen they well may), why not this passage also? But here, we are told, it is only a 'frail foundation', that 'the whole question at issue is begged in the first instance, when it is taken for granted as a fact, that Moses actually delivered this address' (p.443). That is, that when in an address, ascribed *by its title* to Moses, words are found, which none but Moses, or one living in his days, could have used with truth, and these are urged as a proof that the title is correct, and the address Mosaic,—the 'whole question at issue is begged'. Yet on just such internal evidence as this does Bishop Colenso profess to found his own conclusions.*

2. The constant references throughout the book to the passage of the Jordan (iv.22,26,ix.1,xi.31,xii.10,xxvii.2,4,xxx.18,xxxi.2, 13,xxxii.47, see p.171), the strength of the inhabitants of Canaan (iv.38,vii.1,17,ix.1-2,xi.23, see p.158), the utter extermination with which they were to be visited (vii.2-5,16,22-6,xx.16-8, see p.160-1), with such like matters of immediate interest, are another striking proof of its genuineness; more especially as none of these are mentioned in the later prophets. That any writer of their days should have so completely thrown himself into the spirit of the times of which he wrote, and at the same time have had constantly in view, not the elucidation of the history of those times, but the edification of the people of his own, is all but incredible.

3. Several of the *Laws* contained in Deuteronomy could only have originated in these early days of Israel's history. The appointment of cities of refuge (xix.1-13, see p.255-6), which could only be done at the time of the allotment of their inheritances. The regulations concerning war, not merely with the Canaanites,

* Similar expressions, only not quite so decisive, are also to be found in Deut.iv.38,viii.18,ix.1,7,xi.2,5,7,xii.8,xxxi.27 &c.

but with distant nations (xx.,xxi.10-4,xxiii.9-14, see p.275, also Appendix No.3), manifestly written for a time when wars of conquest were probable. Besides others already commented upon (see p.240-53). To suppose that all these were written merely for the sake of the *principles* involved in them, and with no idea of their being ever put in practice, is a very lame way of escaping from the natural conclusion to be deduced from them.

4. In the prophetical parts of the book, many remarkable features in later Jewish history are passed over in silence, which a writer living after the events, and desirous of fabricating a seeming prophecy, such as might give weight and authority to his whole work, would most surely have put prominently forward. The division of the kingdom, the civil wars between the two portions, their diverse sins and fate; the defection of the Priests, the persecution of the Prophets; the destruction of the sanctuary at Shiloh, the building of the temple, and its threatened fate. All these might naturally have found place in a would-be-Mosaic prophecy written by a late inventor, some of them most surely must. Yet none are there.

But we refrain. It is plain that whichever way we look at this book of Deuteronomy, whether at its sentiment, its phraseology, or style; its agreement with the earlier books, or its occasional divergence from them; its allusions to the time then present, its narrative, its laws, its prophecies; the proof of early, of Mosaic origin, is clear and striking. Each new field of inquiry does but open up fresh stores of evidence, independent yet consistent, individually minute but unitedly overwhelming; like the intertwining threads of a mighty cable, or the innumerable fibres of a massy beam, each one supporting and strengthening the other, and together presenting an array of testimony, which forces home the conclusion irresistibly upon our minds,—the discourses of Deuteronomy must have come from the mouth, the pen of Moses, and from none other.

CHAPTER X.

THE BOOK OF JOSHUA.

THE book of Joshua is regarded by Bishop Colenso as a continuation of the Jehovistic record in Numbers, written in the days of David or Solomon; containing also some fragments of earlier Elohistic documents, as well as corrections by the later Deuteronomist. Its minute critical investigation is, for the present, reserved, and he has merely pointed out certain signs of time, which fix it, he argues, as certainly not earlier than the reign of David. To dwell upon it at any length here may seem, therefore, somewhat premature. It supplies, however, such valuable and conclusive evidence upon the point at issue, the date of the Pentateuch, that our inquiries would be incomplete without some allusion to its testimony.

The first point to be determined is, manifestly, its relation to the preceding books. That it was written after the first four books of the Pentateuch, is admitted, and need not therefore be discussed. Was it, however, also written after Deuteronomy? We answer unhesitatingly, it was; and for this reason:—The book of Joshua often quotes and refers to Deuteronomy, and manifestly draws from its pages the information needed respecting former times, rather than from the earlier books, with which Bishop Colenso would connect it. The following are some of the most remarkable instances in point.*

* In making these comparisons the text has been carefully com-

(1) Josh.i.3-5 '*Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread,* have I given unto you, AS I SPAKE UNTO MOSES. *From the desert and* this *Lebanon* even unto the great river, *the river Euphrates,* all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea towards the going down of the sun, *shall be your boundary. There shall not any man be able to stand before* thee'.

Deut.xi.24-5 '*Every place whereon the soles of your feet shall tread* shall be yours; *from the desert and Lebanon,* from the river, *the river Euphrates,* even unto the hinder sea, *shall be your boundary. There shall not any man be able to stand before* you'.†

(2) Joshua i.5-6, 'I *will not fail thee, nor forsake thee. Be strong and firm;* for *thou shalt cause this people to inherit the land, which* I *sware unto their fathers to give them*'.

Deut.xxxi.6-7 '*Be strong and firm;* fear not, nor be terrified by them; for Jehovah thy God is he that goeth with thee; he *will not fail thee, nor forsake thee* . . . for thou must go with *this people* unto *the land, which* Jehovah *sware unto their fathers to give them,* and *thou shalt cause* them *to inherit* it'.

(3) Josh.i.13-5 'Remember the word which MOSES THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH COMMANDED you, *saying, Jehovah your God* hath given you rest, and *hath given you this land. Your wives, your little ones, and your cattle, shall abide* in the land *which* Moses *gave you* beside Jordan; but as for you, *ye shall pass over before your brethren* harnessed, all the heroes of the *force,* and help them; *until Jehovah hath given your brethren rest, as yourselves, and they also possess the land which Jehovah your God giveth them; then ye shall return* unto the land of your *possession, which* Moses the servant of Jehovah *gave you*'.

Deut.iii.18-20 'And I commanded you at that time, *saying, Jehovah your God hath given you this land* to possess it; *ye shall pass over* equipped *before your brethren* the children of Israel, all the men of *force.* But *your wives,* and *your little ones, and your cattle* (I know that ye have much cattle) *shall abide* in your cities *which* I *gave you; until Jehovah hath given your brethren rest, as yourselves, and they also possess the land which Jehovah your God giveth them* beside Jordan; *then ye shall return* every man unto his *possession, which* I *gave you*'.

(4) Josh.xiii.14, 'Only unto *the tribe of Levi* he gave *no inheritance; the fire-offerings of Jehovah* God of Israel are their inheritance, *as he*

---

pared with the original Hebrew, and such renderings been adopted as should most clearly bring out the points of identity or divergence. The portions in italics may be regarded, therefore, as verbally identical in the original, with the exception of a few differences occasioned by the alterations of *person,* and some slight ones in orthography, which no version could represent.

† 'The *great river,* the river Euphrates' occurs in Deut.i.7.

said unto them'. *v.*33. 'But unto *the tribe of Levi*, MOSES gave not an *inheritance; Jehovah*, God of Israel, *He is their inheritance, as he said unto them'*.

Deut.x.9, 'Wherefore Levi hath *no* portion or *inheritance* with his brethren; *Jehovah, He* is his *inheritance, as Jehovah* thy God *said unto* him'. xviii.1-2 'The Priests the Levites all *the tribe of Levi* shall have *no* portion or *inheritance* with Israel; they shall eat *the fire-offerings of Jehovah*, and his inheritance. But they shall have *no inheritance* among their brethren, *Jehovah, He is their inheritance, as he said unto them'*.

(5) Josh.xiv.9, 'And MOSES SWARE on that day, saying, *The land that* thy feet *have trodden upon* shall be *unto thee* for an inheritance, *and unto thy children* for ever, for *thou hast wholly followed Jehovah* my God'.

Deut.i.36, 'Save Caleb the son of Jephunneh; he shall see it, and *to him* will I give *the land that* he *hath trodden upon, and to his children*, because *he hath wholly followed Jehovah'*.

(6) Josh.xxiii.16, 'When ye have transgressed the covenant of Jehovah your God, which he commanded you, and go *and serve other gods, and prostrate yourselves to them; then shall the wrath of Jehovah glow against you, and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which* he *gave you'*.

Deut.xi.16-7, 'Take heed to yourselves that your heart mislead you not, and ye turn aside, *and serve other gods, and prostrate yourselves to them; then shall the wrath of Jehovah glow against you, . . . and ye shall perish quickly from off the good land which* Jehovah *gave you'*.

(7) Josh.xxiv.9-10, 'And sent and called *Balaam the son of Beor to curse* you; *but* I *would not hearken unto Balaam'*.

Deut. xxiii.4-5, 'They hired against thee *Balaam the son of Beor to curse* thee; *but* Jehovah thy God *would not hearken unto Balaam'*.

(8) Many other sentiments and phrases scattered throughout the book remind one strongly of Deuteronomy; *e.g.* 'the place which he should choose' (Josh.ix.27,comp.Deut.xii.5,11,14,18,21,xiv.23,24,25 &c.); 'Jehovah hath dispossessed from before you great nations and mighty; but you, no man hath been able to stand before you' (Josh. xxiii.9, comp.Deut.vii.1,24,ix.1-3,xi.23,25, &c.); 'one of you shall pursue a thousand' (Josh.xxiii.10,comp.Deut.xxxii.30); 'cities which ye built not, vineyards and oliveyards which ye planted not' (Josh. xxiv.13, comp.Deut.vi.10-1), &c. &c.

(9) The account of the blessing and cursing in Josh.viii.30-5 refers to, and presupposes, the commands laid down in Deut.xxvii.2-14; presents also many verbal similarities, *e.g.* the 'altar of whole stones, over which no man hath waved iron', the 'bringing up thereon burnt-offerings unto Jehovah, and sacrificing feast-offerings', the 'writing the law upon the stones' &c. While the ceremony is expressly said to have been performed according to the command of Moses, 'as it is written in the book of the law'.

(10) It is twice mentioned in the book of Joshua, that the dead

bodies of those who were hung were not allowed to remain on the tree after the going down of the sun (viii.29,x.27). The law which commanded this practice is contained in Deut.xxi.22-3.

(11) The utter extermination of the people of Canaan is continually said to have been 'as Moses the servant of Jehovah commanded' (Josh.ix.24,xi.12,15,20 &c); in allusion doubtless to the injunctions contained in Deuteronomy (vii.1-5,16,25-6,xii.2-3,xx.16-8, &c).

The passages here referred to, it will be observed, are not mere isolated scraps, such as might perhaps have been inserted by a later editor, but are intrinsic portions of the book, inextricably interwoven with its main substance, and therefore clearly due to its own author. That the Deuteronomist should have copied from Joshua is *a priori* most improbable, and in the case of some of the instances referred to, quite impossible. Five of them are distinctly references to Moses' words (1) (3) (4) (5) (9), one out of the number to Moses' *written* words (9); words which are recorded only in Deuteronomy. Allusions to the other books there also are, but by no means so frequent or so pointed; in three instances, in fact, the writer of Joshua had the choice of quoting from Exodus or Numbers, or from Deuteronomy (1) (3) (5); he invariably preferred the latter. This negatives at once the idea of its being a continuation of the earlier Jehovistic narrative. Its opening, its whole tone, its close, render it far more properly a continuation of Deuteronomy. But whatever may have been the author's purpose in composing it, whoever that author may have been, thus much at least is certain,—among the materials out of which he wrought his book were the addresses of Moses, now known to us as the Second Law; addresses which *he* at all events regarded as genuine productions.

The establishment of this fact, the later date of the book of Joshua, gives us a new stand-point from which to regard many of the questions discussed in the preceding chapters. We have already had occasion to refer to its testimony respecting the Priests and Levites (p.227-8), and the Levitical cities (p.241-2), as demonstrating the substantial harmony existing between

written the various covenants with Israel, already alluded to (p.303-4). This book was committed by Moses to the Levites (Deut.xxxi.26), to be placed 'beside the ark', within therefore the Holy of Holies, whither none but the High Priest might come, and he but once a year. The document was clearly not intended for common use, but was laid up, like the two tables of stone, by way of memorial. What became of it during the many vicissitudes which befell the ark and Tabernacle, we know not, simply because it did not come within the scope and purpose of the history to tell us. In the Temple, however, was it ultimately found, and by the High Priest. The house of God was undergoing repairs (2Kings,xxii.4-7), and every portion of it was doubtless carefully examined, including the Holy of Holies, of course by the High Priest himself. There, then, Hilkiah probably discovered it. That, lying where it did, it should have escaped destruction mid the idolatries and sacrilege of Manasseh and Amon, and at the same time have been hitherto overlooked in the more God-fearing reign of their successor, is perfectly natural and credible. Nor can it excite surprise, that during such long rebellion against Jehovah copies of the Pentateuch, either in whole or part, had become very scarce, so that its words had been as yet unheard by the youthful monarch. The alleged relaxation of zeal in the later part of his reign (arising, according to Bishop Colenso, from his discovery of the imposture which had been practised on him) rests wholly upon the evidence of *silence*;—there is no mention of any of the other feasts being held, nor even of another passover, therefore none *were* held. Rather, we may say, there is no mention of *any act of Josiah whatever* during the last 13 years of his reign, except his war with Pharaoh-Nechoh at its close; shall we therefore conclude that he did *nothing* during all that time? Had we 'the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah', wherein were written 'the rest of the acts of Josiah, and all that he did', we might have some ground to argue upon. But it is lost to us irre-

22. 'forsake Jehovah', xxiv.20.
23. 'Jehovah *your* God, *thy* God' &c., 35 times.

The evidence here presented cuts two ways. 1. The large number of Deuteronomistic phrases in the book of Joshua presents us with another argument against its being viewed as a continuation of Numbers, as Bishop Colenso seems to regard it. 2. The large number of phrases peculiar to the earlier books, yet found in this still later Joshua, shews that their omission from Deuteronomy cannot be looked upon as a sign of time; that, for instance, the omission of any mention of the 'tabernacle' &c. did not arise from its having now passed out of sight, as Bishop Colenso supposes.

But the most important conclusion to be deduced from this later date of Joshua, has yet to be discussed. The book of Joshua, we say, was certainly written after Deuteronomy. If, then, we can determine the date of the former, we shall also determine approximately the date of the latter, at all events establish a 'terminus ad quem', before which it must have been written. We shall first consider the signs of time adduced by Bishop Colenso.

1. In Josh.x.13 mention is made of 'the book of Jasher', and of the account in it of the sun standing still. Now in 2Sam.i.18 David's lamentation over Saul and Jonathan is also said to be 'written in the book of Jasher'. Clearly, then, this book was of later date than David. Whence it follows, that the narrative in Joshua cannot have been written until after his accession to the throne.

The word 'Jasher' means 'upright, or righteous', almost identical in meaning, indeed, with 'Jeshurun', and is doubtless used with the same reference, as a title of the people of Israel; the book being probably a collection of national songs. This meaning of the title Bishop Colenso admits. Wherein, then, lies the difficulty? Since surely it is quite conceivable, that *additions* should be made from time to time to such a volume, as fresh matter accumulated; and so the book be, perhaps, referred

to listen to the truth, at least in some things; his lack of steadfastness; and the superior power and influence of the more degraded princes, are precisely in accordance with other facts recorded of him (see Jer.xxxvii.3,17-21,xxxviii.5-28), and quite sufficient to account for the making and breaking of this covenant concerning servants, without any supposition of imposture and discovery whatever.

The real strength of both these arguments lies, in truth, in the assumption, that before this time no trace of the existence of the Pentateuch, or at all events of the book of Deuteronomy, is to be found. The utter groundlessness of such an assumption, and its incompatibility with the plain facts of the case, and especially with the testimony of the book of Joshua, has been already demonstrated. Lest, however, it should be thought, that so important a point, as the existence of the written law before the times of Josiah, rests solely on this ground of evidence, it may be as well to show, in conclusion, that it is also clearly set forth in the contemporary history and literature. Mere allusions to the facts recorded in the Pentateuch, such as those in Ps.lxxviii.,cv.-vi., &c., are of course incapable of establishing the point in question. What we want are references to laws, commandments, statutes &c., as existing in writing, and ascribed to Moses; which laws are clearly the same with those now existing in the Pentateuch. Nor have we to search far to find such.

In the history of Hezekiah, Josiah's predecessor by 57 years, we read that 'he clave unto Jehovah, and departed not from after him, but kept his commandments, which Jehovah *commanded Moses*' (2Kings,xviii.6). Which commandments clearly included the removal of high-places, and destruction of idols (*v.*4); not to mention the due observance of the Temple-worship, the keeping of the Passover, and the provision for the priests, of which the Chronicler further tells us(2 Chron.xxix.-xxxi.). About the same time we read also of the ten tribes, that they were carried captive, 'because they obeyed not the voice of Jehovah

the royal city, for that we read was captured by Judah, shortly after the death of Joshua (Jud.i.8), but the mountain stronghold which lay between Judah and Benjamin, yet which neither of them could secure (comp. Jud.i.21), and which we find again alluded to in Jud.xix.10.* When, then, were the Jebusites at last expelled? 2Sam.v.6-9 and 1Chron.xi.4-7 tell us plainly, at the *commencement* of the reign of *David*. Even him they defied, but the prowess of Joab triumphed, and he received the post of chief-captain as a reward; *then* were the Jebusites at last dispossessed. But, at the time when the book of Joshua was written, the Jebusites were *not* dispossessed. Clearly, then, the book of Joshua must have been written *before the accession of David*.†

2. Josh.xvi.10. 'And they [the children of Ephraim] dis-

---

* Respecting this name Jerusalem we may remark as follows:— It was clearly known in the days of Joshua, not however as the name of a single city, but, as in the case of Hebron and Debir noticed before (p.110-1), of a district as well. The name 'Jebus' seems to have been of later origin, given probably by the Israelites to this particular stronghold on account of those who inhabited it. Thus, in Josh.xv.8, xviii.28 we have 'the *Jebusi*, which is Jerusalem'; while whenever the kingdom, district, or royal city are mentioned, we have simply Jerusalem. On the conquest of David the more ancient name was again exclusively employed. The argument which Bishop Colenso would found upon the mention of 'Salem' in Gen.xiv.18, as proving its post-Davidic origin is, therefore, utterly futile (see p.107).

† In opposition to this, the natural conclusion to be drawn from the passage, some will doubtless be ready to object, that the 'abiding with the children of Judah at Jerusalem' spoken of, merely refers to that remnant of the original population, who remained there after the conquest by David; *e.g.* Araunah the Jebusite. That this is *not* the meaning of the passage, appears, however, in two ways. 1. It is not merely said, that 'the Jebusites abode with the children of Judah', but that these latter '*could not dispossess them*', a phrase certainly wholly inapplicable to the state of things after the conquest of David. 2. In the parallel place in Judges (i.21), the same is said of 'the children of *Benjamin*', to whom 'Jebusi' was originally allotted (Josh.xviii.28), thereby clearly shewing that in *fact* it belonged to neither. Such a reference to Benjamin, after Jerusalem had become the capital of the tribe of Judah, would be most incongruous.

possessed not the Canaanites abiding in Gezer; the Canaanites abide among the Ephraimites *unto this day*, and were serving under tribute'. Two points here present themselves for notice. (1) The Gezrites were still abiding among the Ephraimites, when the book of Joshua was written. But, in 1Kings,ix.16 we read that 'Pharaoh king of Egypt went up and *conquered Gezer*, and burnt it with fire, and *slew the Canaanites that abode in the city*, and gave it for a dowry unto his daughter, Solomon's wife'. Before the reign of Solomon, then, must this statement have been written. (2) The *relation* of these Gezrites to the Ephraimites is defined, they were 'not dispossessed', but 'were *serving under tribute*'. The tense here used is the same as in the previous 'abide', the apparent difference above being merely to suit the requirements of English idiom. The literal rendering would be 'the Canaanites *abode* among the Ephraimites unto this day, and were serving under tribute'. There can be no doubt, then, but that the author intended them to be equivalent, and wrote, therefore, at a time, when these Canaanites were not only still 'abiding in Gezer', but still 'serving under tribute'. But if so, then most surely before the war with Jabin and Sisera; since that Gezer should have been tributary to Israel then, lying as it did in the very territory oppressed by the Canaanites, is utterly incredible. Before, indeed, most probably, *any* foreign yoke had yet been pressed upon Israel's neck; while the tribes were 'strong' (comp.Josh.xvii.13,Jud.i.28,30,33,35); in the period, that is, from the death of Joshua to the oppression of Chushan-rishathaim (Jud.iii.8), when 'the elders that outlived Joshua' still judged the people, and 'Israel served Jehovah'. In this period, without doubt, was the book of Joshua written, most probably by one of these very elders. And with this agrees well the entire absence from it of any notice of the people's defection from Jehovah, excepting only the meagre hint referred to above (xxiv.31, comp.v.14).

Once more, in Josh.vi.25 we read, 'And Rahab the harlot,

and her father's house, and all belonging to her, Joshua kept alive; and *she abideth in Israel unto this day*; because she hid the messengers which Joshua sent to spy out Jericho'. The most natural interpretation to be put upon these words certainly is, that Rahab was still living when the book of Joshua was written. We know that she married one of the princes of Judah (Matt.i.5), the son of one of those who numbered the people in the wilderness (Nu.i.7). She may well, therefore, have outlived Joshua. Had the expression been written by a much later writer, of Rahab's family, it would surely have been '*they* abide in Israel', especially as her own descendants were certainly not counted as a separate race or family, but were of the tribe of Judah (comp. also Jud.i.16,iv.11).

The application of these conclusions to the question immediately at issue, the date of Deuteronomy, is too self-evident to need more than barely stating.—The book of Joshua was written before the troublous period of the judges had commenced, within a few years after Joshua's death. But the book of Joshua continually refers to and quotes Deuteronomy. The book of Deuteronomy, then, *must* have been written at a *still earlier date*.

Lastly, this book of Joshua presents us with an additional and important illustration of the way in which these earlier books were written, the sources from which they were derived. Thrice in the Pentateuch is mention made of Moses writing down the covenants of God with Israel, in a book;—immediately after the giving of the law (Ex.xxiv.4,7), at the close of the second forty-days' sojourn in the Mount (Ex.xxxiv.27), and on the occasion of the renewal of the covenant in the plains of Moab (Deut.xxxi.9,24-6). The 'book of the law' in which these covenants, probably also the other laws, were written, was given, we are told, to the Priests the Levites (Deut.xxxi.9,26, comp.xvii.18) to lay up beside the ark. Once more in Joshua have we mention of this book. He also made a 'covenant with

Bible, seemed scarcely sufficient. Nor was the popular ground of belief—tradition,—so firm and reasonable, as that we might securely leave to it the maintenance of a just view upon the subject. It was necessary to shew, that the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch rested upon clear and convincing testimony, both external and internal, and was therefore worthy of belief on critical grounds, as well as mere tradition. This we have endeavoured to do, partly by a detailed discussion of the true bearing of those points of evidence advanced by Bishop Colenso in support of his theory, partly by the development of fresh testimony. Here, chiefly, have we to complain of incompleteness. The positive argument, for the early and Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, has not been fully set forth. We have been content to prove it, beyond dispute as we trust, rather than to present the reader with *all* the proofs which might be fairly urged on its behalf. The object with which we started has, however, been accomplished. Bishop Colenso's theories have been shewn to be incompatible with the plain facts of the case; the time-honoured view, with some important modifications, the only one really adequate to explain all the varied phenomena which the Pentateuch exhibits.

It will be remembered that there were three principal propositions, which we said Bishop Colenso endeavoured to establish in the volumes now before us. The first of these—that the Pentateuch was a compilation,—the evidence considered has led us to admit. The second—that its authors lived between the times of Samuel and Jeremiah,—that same evidence has shewn to be utterly untenable. The third and most important remains to be discussed; viz., that the object of its authors was not to hand down an authentic history, either of the events narrated, or the laws connected with them, but merely to convey religious Truth to the people of their *own time* in the form most calculated to produce a deep and lasting impression; in which Truth, accordingly, consists the whole value of their writings. This propo-

CHAPTER XI.

THE PENTATEUCH AND ITS OBSERVANCE.

(Bishop Colenso, Part III., Chap. III., VII.—X. (in part))

If Scripture History made mention of all things, whose absence is advanced by critics as an objection to its veracity, it would be, verily, one of the most complicated and elaborate records in existence. Multitudes of minute particulars concerning things utterly foreign to its true purpose, detailed disquisitions on trifling points of history, geography, and literature, full and complete information as to the precise causes, manner of occurrence, and consequences, of every event narrated, must be inserted. No hint dropped in one part of the history, that is not expanded at length elsewhere; no allusions to customs, things, or places, of which full details are not given; no law recorded, whose observance is not also related, with every circumstantial belonging to it; but every statement clear, explicit and precise, fitting in and according with every other with mathematical exactness. Such, in plain language, is the sort of history, which many modern critics of the Bible seem to think it ought to contain.

Whether, if such a history existed, it would satisfy their demands, may be reasonably doubted. Its very fulness and precision, its minutely-studied consistency, would probably become an objection to its genuineness. Since what should lead a writer of those ancient days, when historical criticism was as yet unknown, to compose such a record? Much rather might it be the artful and ingenious fraud of some far later time, written

been some in our own days, who by long continued, arduous study have discovered the meaning of Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions, though written in an unknown tongue. But to the bulk of mankind these books of God are as meaningless, as those inscriptions to any but the few initiated. Therefore did God add to these Books the further volume of his Written Word, which should teach men in their own language, in clear and simple, yet heart-piercing words, the truths which he perceived were necessary to their well-being and salvation.

He might have chosen to write every word in this volume himself, even as he wrote with his own finger the ten words spoken from Mount Sinai. He might have summed up in a few, brief sentences the substance of religious Truth, and human Duty; and committed these to man as the sole, infallible rule of faith and practice. There are some who seem to think he should have done so, and who hence would fain exalt the Bible into such a creed and code. Its own plain testimony tells us that he has not done so. Truth in its concentrated essence, its abstract form, however clearly comprehended, is, in its effect upon the human heart and life, all but powerless. To be effectual it must be seen personified, in action, tangible. To be received in all its force by man, it must be presented to him in human form. Therefore did God, when giving unto man a written volume for his instruction in religious Truth, ever link that truth with something human. Even in the didactic portions, where absolute divine control might have seemed almost a benefit, has God still left his revelation human. Isaiah may prophecy, with all the authority, and in the express name, of Jehovah; Paul may rebuke, exhort, instruct, and claim for his words the reverence and attention due to Christ's; yet is there no mistaking which is Isaiah and which Paul. Each uses his own language, arranges his subject according to his own mind, follows out his own line of thought, selects his own illustrations, has his own object in composing, to which every thought and fact is made to bend.

David, Solomon, and indeed all the pious kings, offer continually at 'high places', which do not seem to have been considered sinful until the reign of Hezekiah, and more especially of *Josiah*. So again, there is not the slightest indication in the history of these times, of the observance of the feasts, the reading of the law at the feast of tabernacles, the attendance of all the adult males at the sanctuary three times a year, the payment of tithes, the sabbatical years, the cities of refuge, the king's writing out a copy of the law, &c. &c. Had these laws really been laid down by Moses they would surely have been observed. Their non-observance shews them to have been of later date, and also of no great authority or reputation.

The greater number of the cases of non-observance thus alleged are set aside by the principle just enunciated. They rest exclusively upon the evidence of *silence;* silence upon points, which it did come within the scope of the history to allude to; a ground of evidence, therefore, according to the rules originally laid down,* utterly worthless. We do not know anything about the observance of these laws. To conclude from this, that they were not observed, or were not in existence, would be as wise and logical, as to conclude, that, because a modern history, say Alison's Europe, makes no mention of a vast number of laws and customs in force in the various countries treated of, therefore these laws and customs were *not* in force. The answer to any one who should urge such an objection as this, would plainly be,—the mention of these laws and customs did not come within the scope of the history in question, and therefore was omitted. Just such is our answer to the bulk of Bishop Colenso's objections concerning the non-observance of the Mosaic laws.

One of the instances alleged is, however, of a different kind. The practice of sacrificing at high-places was undoubtedly much in vogue in the times referred to; yet was it contrary to the Pentateuch. But one point more is needed to make the argument, founded upon these facts by Bishop Colenso, complete, viz. the suppressed premiss of his first syllogism:—it is

* See Hist. Charact. Pent. Introduct.p.xv.

incredible that a Mosaic law should have existed at these times without being strictly observed.* This is assumed throughout, and herein lies the fallacy of the whole line of reasoning. For the existence of a law of admittedly supreme authority, and its utter neglect in practice, irreconcilable as they may seem in theory, are found to be perfectly compatible in fact. Let us take a case by way of illustration.

The authority of the Bible, as the supreme standard of appeal both in faith and practice, was unquestionably recognised theoretically by all the great church-leaders during the middle ages. Its inspiration was a received article of belief, its words regarded with superstitious reverence, its meaning by many deeply studied. Yet were some of its plainest commands disregarded, its most characteristic doctrines ignored; itself, to the bulk of the people, a sealed, if not an unknown book. Surely, it might be argued, such antiscriptural practices as saint and image-worship, auricular confession, or communion in one kind; such antiscriptural doctrines as the papal supremacy, purgatory, or transubstantiation, could never have arisen, or been permitted, at a time when the Bible was known and honoured. The acceptance of such by the *people* might, indeed, be allowed as possible, on account of their ignorance and credulity; but how could their priests, their teachers, above all the heads of the church,—how could *they* give countenance to such, who knew the Bible and admitted its authority? Even if the bulk of these be excepted, as of too ordinary mind to deviate from the trodden path of custom, yet

* His argument, formally stated, would be as follows. 1. It is incredible that a Mosaic law should have existed in the times of Samuel, David and Solomon without being observed; but the practice of confining sacrifices to one place was *not observed* in those times; therefore no Mosaic law commanding this could have been in existence then. 2. No Mosaic law confining sacrifices to one place was in existence in the days of Samuel, David and Solomon; but the law in Deuteronomy *does* thus confine them; therefore the law in Deuteronomy was *not Mosaic*, and (probably) of later date than these times.

how shall we explain the adherence of original thinkers, of great scholars, to such manifest errors,—Gregory, Bernard, or Aquinas? If the non-observance of a few of the Pentateuchal laws by Samuel, David and Solomon, be a conclusive argument for later origin, much rather should the more striking deviation, both in doctrine and practice, of such men as these, from the plain meaning of Scripture, be an argument for *its* later origin. But in this case we know for certain, that the Bible *was* known and highly revered at the very time when its contents were thus ignored. Why not then the Pentateuch revered and known by Samuel or the earlier kings?

But, it may be said, in the case here referred to we can trace the gradual growth of these various doctrines and practices, as arising out of the circumstances and tendencies of the times, and thus readily account for their acceptance, even by diligent and unfettered students of the Scriptures. They were, moreover, for the most part long-established, and either contained a considerable admixture of Truth, or were apparently so beneficial in their effects, that they might well be passed over without protest. Granted. May not, however, the same be said of the partial non-observance of the Mosaic laws in the times referred to? Our sources of information respecting the intermediate period are scanty, truly; still we can learn enough, either directly or by implication, to make the matter tolerably plain.

The evidence of the book of Joshua, already considered, leaves us no room for doubt, but that the Mosaic legislation was in full force at the time of the first settlement of the tribes in Canaan, and, we may therefore suppose, during all that period when Israel is said to have 'served Jehovah' (Josh.xxiv.31,Jud.ii.7). The covenant was renewed by the solemn ceremony at Mounts Ebal and Gerizzim (Josh.viii.30-5); the Tabernacle was set up at Shiloh (xviii.1), and the altar there universally recognized as the *only one* where sacrifices might legally be offered (xxii.16, 19,23,29); cities of refuge were appointed (xx.); the Levitical

cities apportioned out (xxi.). Thrice, too, were the people specially exhorted by Joshua to 'keep the commandment and the law, which Moses the servant of Jehovah charged them', to keep and to do all that was written in the book of the Law of Moses' (xxii.5,xxiii.6); besides the final covenant at Shechem already alluded to (p.303-4). To this period, also, do the later histories point back, as a time when the festivals were duly celebrated (comp.2Kings,xxiii.22,Neh.viii.17).

Not long, however, did this continue. Intercourse with the remnant of the Canaanites, scattered throughout the land; the distance of many of the people from the sanctuary; their natural desire for household worship, and personal performance of the rite of sacrifice; coupled with the universal longing for something visible and tangible to worship;—these various causes, in their mutual action and reaction, speedily brought about a general neglect of the house of God at Shiloh, and with it also a disregard for the more irksome of the Mosaic laws. The history of Micah and his ephod, recorded in Jud.xvii.-viii., is a prominent example of the way in which idolatry crept in among the people, in the midst of much real veneration for Jehovah, and respect for his appointed priests (xvii.3,13). The narrative of the war against Benjamin shews us, that with all the defection from the purity of their religion, some of the festivals at Shiloh, one at least every year, when all the people went up, were still observed (xxi.19). Here first, also, we hear of the ark being at times in other places than the Tabernacle, and of sacrifices being offered, and special altars built before it; and that under the direction of Phinehas, the avenger of the plains of Moab, who had lived and talked with Moses and Aaron (xx.18,26-8,xxi.2-4). What wonder if a custom introduced under such authority, and so agreeable to the circumstances of the times, should ere long have grown into an habitual reverence for the 'high-places' whither the ark was thus conveyed (in circuit probably), whether it was actually there or not.

In the troublous times which followed, when Israel was constantly falling into idolatry, or subject to the yoke of alien powers; when the tribes were sundered in interest and fate, and civil war not rarely added its horrors to foreign oppression;—in such times it was enough for judges, prophets, priests, to recall the erring people from open, flagrant sin, from the worship of Moloch, Chemosh, Baal, Ashtaroth; and gladly were high-places tolerated, if the people would but worship there Jehovah. Nor do these special seats of holiness, Mizpah, Bethel, Gibeon, Ramah, seem ever to have been made the seats of idols. They were the acknowledged sanctuaries of Jehovah, just like Shiloh; they might be forsaken, but were not yet polluted. Those judges, too, whom God raised up from various tribes, offered him sacrifices and were accepted (Jud.vi.21,26,xi.31,xiii.16-23), and thus the neglect of the Mosaic law confirmed and sanctioned as it were by Jehovah himself. That law was probably to the bulk of the people utterly unknown. To restore its authority was altogether too great a work to be attempted or required then. Faith in God, and fidelity to him, were all that was demanded of leaders or people; too often even these were wanting.

Once only towards the close of this tempestuous, rugged age does a Priest appear upon the scene, and then, as might have been expected, once more do Shiloh and its services come forth to view. Its yearly feast was still observed (1Sam.i.3,21,ii.19), its altar still the appointed place of sacrifice, albeit Eli's sons had changed the old established laws of the priest's portion, and by their violence and profligacy deterred the people from obeying God's commands (ii.13-7,22).* Speedily were their sins visited upon them. The ark of God was taken, and when after seven months captivity it was at length restored, it was to be lodged in

* The evidence thus afforded of the antiquity of those former laws of sacrifice, for ignoring which the priests were smitten, is too self-evident to need comment.

a private house at Kirjath-jearim, not to be brought again to Shiloh. Themselves were slain, their father overcome with the ill tidings, the sanctuary itself destroyed. Fixed place of worship then was none; and when affliction and oppression for twenty years at length brought Israel to themselves, and Samuel rose to judge them; when they removed their idols, and 'served Jehovah only'; he sought not to restore at once the ancient order, for which the unsettled state of the people seemed not ripe, but giving his attention rather to the *spirit* of religion than the *form*, he still sanctioned the high-places, and went himself 'from year to year in circuit unto Bethel, and the Gilgal, and the Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all these places', returning ever to his house at Ramah, where also was an altar built (vii.16-7). Where at this time stood the Tabernacle, where the passovers were celebrated, more fully, it would seem (according to tradition), than even in the days of David and Solomon (2Chron. xxxv.18,comp.xxx.26), we are not told. In Saul's days we have mention of a priest at Shiloh (1Sam.xiv.3), and a little further on of the Tabernacle at Nob, where were no fewer than 85 priests (xxi.1-6,xxii.18-9); while the ark, still separate from the place of worship, was sometimes with the army (xiv.18), and yet again at Baale of Judah (2Sam.vi.2, comp. also vii.6-7).

Not until the reign of David does there seem to have been any tendency to centralize the worship of the people at a single sanctuary, and even this was rather indirectly through the natural attraction of the royal city, than from any special effort against the high-places. These were still the revered and popular sanctuaries, one of them (that at Gibeon) even surpassing it would seem the fame of Zion, for there the Chronicler tells us stood 'the Tabernacle of the congregation' (1Chron.xvi. 39-40,xxi.29,2Chron.i.3),* there was the 'great high-place'

* The objections of Bishop Colenso to this statement will be found discussed in Appendix No.3, they have too little connection with our present inquiries to be considered here.

(1Kings,iii.4). The reason for this continued worship at the high-places we are distinctly told; 'because there was no house built unto the name of Jehovah' (1Kings,iii.2). David had desired to perform this work, but his petition was refused, and not until the reign of his successor was it finally accomplished. Then, most surely, should the high-places have been done away, and Moses' law restored as in the days of Joshua. Partially, indeed, it was so; and to the house of God at Jerusalem did all the people constantly resort (xii.27); but their affection for their ancient seats of worship still continued, and as Solomon lacked either zeal or courage for the work, they were suffered to remain.

Up to this time their influence upon the people had been for good, henceforth it became all but unmixed evil. The example of their greatest monarch, in building groves and altars to heathen deities; the setting up a visible object of worship in one of the most honoured sites, the hill of Bethel, with the restoration of idolatry at Dan, by Jeroboam and the seceded tribes; the influence of the still numerous though tributary Canaanites;—all combined to sink the nation once more in idolatry. 'They built them high-places, and images, and groves, on every high hill, and under every bushy tree' (xiv.23). Partial reformations from time to time there were; idols and groves were swept away, but the high-places still remained, to be again turned into grievous sins, so soon as the cleansing hand had passed away. Not until the heavy judgments of God had begun to fall upon the land, and worse yet were threatened, while the fate of the ten tribes added point to every warning, did two of Judah's greatest monarchs, Hezekiah and Josiah, supported by her two greatest prophets, Isaiah and Jeremiah, attempt, too late, to root the evil custom out. Their efforts died with them, and the sinful habit was not finally eradicated till seventy years of long captivity had taught the people the reality of those dread curses on rebellion and idolatry, uttered some thousand years before in Moab's plains.

These facts, when carefully and candidly considered, must surely be pronounced amply sufficient to account, both for the non-observance of the original Mosaic law in Israel's palmiest days, and also for the strenuous efforts to enforce it in still later times; and that more naturally than can be done by any forced hypothesis of later origin. Where there is no law, there is no transgression. If, then, the overthrow of high-places in Josiah's reign is to be ascribed to the influence of laws then first promulgated, how comes it that the permission of high-places, even for the worship of Jehovah, by previous kings, is spoken of as sin! Again, the earlier laws in Leviticus are as opposed to high-places as those in Deuteronomy; yet is this book of Leviticus assigned to the days of Solomon, the chief offender in this very matter, who could have nipped the evil in its bud, but failed. Deuteronomy is assigned to Josiah's reign, because of his exertions to remove high-places; yet was Hezekiah full as zealous,—whence then his efforts? It is plain, that this theory of later origin, plausible as it at first sight appears, is really beset with difficulties at least as formidable as those alleged to exist in the ordinary view. But these latter have been shewn to be, in great part, difficulties merely in appearance, which disappear when the peculiar circumstances of the times are taken into account. Again, therefore, does the balance of probabilities, on Bishop Colenso's own evidence, turn in favour of the Mosaic, rather than the later origin of the Pentateuch. If the Pentateuch belong to the times of the monarchy, Jewish history is a riddle, only to be solved by ignoring large portions of it as utterly unreal and fabulous. Grant it Mosaic, and the whole is clear and consistent, with no more of difficulty in it, than might reasonably be expected to attach to a history so meagre in many respects, as we have seen this to be.

There are yet, however, two special incidents in the later times of the Jewish monarchy to be discussed, as points insisted upon by Bishop Colenso somewhat strongly;—The

finding of the book of the law in the Temple, in the reign of Josiah (2Kings,xxii.-iii.); and the attempted re-enforcement of the Pentateuchal law of servants, in the reign of Zedekiah (Jer. xxxiv.). His view concerning the first of these may be thus summed up.

> The book of Deuteronomy was composed probably by the prophet Jeremiah, with the connivance of Hilkiah the priest, and Huldah the prophetess. When written it was carried into the Temple, where shortly afterwards Hilkiah found it. He sent it to the king, who deeply impressed with its words, then heard for the first time, inquired of Huldah concerning them. She confirmed their divine authority, whereupon the king hastened to carry them into effect, made a new covenant with the people, caused all high-places and abominations to be put away, celebrated the passover, and in fact used every exertion to enforce the law in all its details. Subsequently, however, it would seem that the true facts of the case became known to him, as we find no mention of any of the other feasts (on which equal stress is laid in the law) being observed, or even of another passover.

That Josiah was not intimately acquainted with the Pentateuch until the discovery of this 'book of the law', and that it was the occasion of his strenuous efforts after reformation, no one will for an instant dispute. But to argue from this, that the book, or any part of it, was then first heard of, is most unwarrantable. As well might we argue from Luther's discovery of a New Testament in the library of Erfurt, and the wonderful effects which followed, that it also was a later forgery, written by some pious spirit of those benighted ages under the names of Apostles and Evangelists to give weight to his words, and hid away there on purpose for Luther to find. Even Bishop Colenso finds it hard to justify or excuse the fraud necessarily involved in his theory. Fortunately the fraud is only theoretical, and the plain facts of the case give us no reason to doubt, that the occurrence was any other than a real unexpected finding of a real copy of the law of Moses. The particular phrases employed, the 'book of the law', the 'book of the covenant', seem to point unmistakeably to that original record, wherein were

'assumed', but is shewn to be most distinctly stated and implied by the preceding narrative, as also their all accompanying him into Egypt (p.16-23); while the denial of either of these facts involved enormous difficulties quite independent of the objection immediately under discussion (p.28-30). (iii) That both the passages alleged in objection are fully stated and discussed. Deut.x.22 being admitted as apparently favouring Bishop Colenso's view, but not sufficiently conclusive to necessitate its adoption, being quite explicable on the other (p.27). Gen.xlii. 26-7 being shewn to present really no warrant whatever for the two main points of the argument founded upon it, viz., the corn so brought being the *sole means of support* for Jacob's household, and its lasting them *twelve months*; these two are assumptions of Bishop Colenso (p.26).

2. The second specimen of 'fallacy' instanced is open to the same remark as the first;—one portion only of the explanation offered is selected for comment, and yet spoken of as if it were the whole. Bishop Colenso's objection concerning the disproportion between the number of the Priests (three), and the duties and provision assigned to them, is met in two ways, 1st by shewing that the duties and provision were not nearly so great as he had argued; 2nd by shewing that the number of the Priests was probably far greater. The first of these two perfectly independent lines of argument he takes no notice of, but represents his objection as disposed of by the second exclusively. This first argument consists of three positions. (*a*) A large proportion of the laws of sacrifice were avowedly, others by necessary implication, never intended for the sojourn in the wilderness, but only for the land of Canaan. (*b*) Not all the people were required to offer sacrifices, but only heads of households, or about *one-tenth* of the whole population. (*c*) The sacrificial system as a whole appears to have been in almost total abeyance during the sojourn, even in those portions which did refer to the wilderness (p. 146-51). This part of the argument, is summed up as follows; p.151,—

> It is clear, then, that no very heavy duties can have been laid upon the priests during all this time, no very enormous provision made for their sustenance, no impossible or incredible circumstances involved, even if there were but three of them, as Bishop Colenso supposes.

Then follows the part to which he alludes, about the number of the priests. So far, therefore, from this latter being the sole

ground of explanation, as Bishop Colenso represents it, it is not once referred to until the difficulty is declared to be at an end; it is only introduced as a subordinate argument, yet further shewing the futility of the objection, though not at all necessary to its removal.

With regard to the argument itself, we may observe, that the particular number, 50, is nowhere laid stress upon, but is distinctly said to be conjectural. It is the number there would be, if the priests' households were of the average size. Perhaps as Nadab and Abihu died childless, they were probably somewhat below that average. But this does not in any way militate against the *facts*, on which stress *is* laid, viz., that the priests had servants, and that these servants were allowed by the law to partake of the holy things, and were therefore probably qualified to act as inferior priests (p.152-3). Lev.x.12,16, is admitted to refer exclusively to Aaron's lineal descendants (p.153, note).

3. The third fallacy instanced is introduced with a misquotation, not indeed in words, but seriously in sense. Anyone reading Bishop Colenso's note, would certainly imagine that on p.61 reference was made to 'another objection which Bishop Colenso urges with great force' against the Historic Character of the Pentateuch, 'and which, if established, would be fatal to the entire argument' in favour of that Historic Character. Turn to p.61, however, and it appears that the objection is merely one to that particular explanation of the first-born difficulty, set forth in the four preceding pages, which objection 'if established, would be fatal to the entire argument' therein contained. Rather a different meaning certainly.

And this misconstruction colours the whole of Bishop Colenso's comment. He has referred to the answer to this particular objection, as if it were the sole ground of explanation offered for the whole first-born difficulty; has again taken the least important part of the argument, and ignored that on which the author laid most stress, viz., the Scriptural account of the constitution of an Israelitish household, and the relation of the children in it to its head (p.57-60). Even thus, however, he is not fair, saying that it is asserted, 'that the first-born of *man* were *not* to be openers of the womb', a proposition certainly opposed to scripture; whereas the argument (founded upon scripture exclusively, and among other passages that referred to by himself, Ex.xiii.2) really is, that not *all* openers of the womb, in the case of *man*, were endowed with the privileges of first-born, or were required to be redeemed (p.61-2).

We should be loath to ascribe these misrepresentations to intentional unfairness, but misrepresentations they certainly are, and as such quite unworthy of one who desires to be 'candidly' and 'honestly' dealt with in all that he himself advances, and who has especially complained of this very sort of unfairness, which now he shews (see Part II.,pref.,p.xii.-xiv).

APPENDIX No. II.

CORRECTIONS TO PREVIOUS VOLUME.

THE perusal of some of the works put forth by other writers in answer to Bishop Colenso's Part I,* together with the further study of the subject, involved in the preparation of the present volume, have led to some alterations of opinion respecting certain details of the arguments contained in our own answer, which it may be as well briefly to set before the reader.

1. THE AGE OF JUDAH.

In p.3, note, the age of Judah, at the time of Joseph's sale into Egypt, is reckoned as 20 years, in accordance with Bishop Colenso, and the generally received opinion. This is deduced from the known age of Joseph at the time, 17 (Gen.xxxvii.2), and the length of Jacob's sojourn with Laban, 20 years (xxxi.38). Six of these being after the birth of Joseph (xxx.25,xxxi.45), 7 before his marriage with Leah (xxix.20), thus leaving just 7 more during which his other sons were born. Now Judah, we read, was the 4th son by Leah. There could not, therefore, on this calculation, have been above 3 years difference between him and Joseph. It has been suggested by some, however (and among others by Kennicott), that the 20 years spoken of in Gen.xxxi.38,41 is a different period from the 14 and 6 years of *v.*41,—a period of neighbourly, or more properly of *household*, service, whereas these were periods of *hired* service,—and so the whole stay of Jacob with Laban was 40 years. This additional 20 would of course be reckoned between the 7 years' service for Rachel (xxix.27,30), and the 6 years' service for the cattle. So far as the expressions in xxxi.38,41, are concerned, there is

* Viz. The replies of Dr. McCaul, Rev. W. Chamberlain, Rev. T. R. Birks, and Dr. A. Benisch, besides pamphlets, reviews, &c.

nothing to favour this hypothesis, the ordinary view seeming, indeed, rather preferable. The following difficulties, however, presented by that view, but entirely removed by the adoption of Kennicott's suggestion, appear decisive on the point. Calling the two views respectively A and B, we may compare them thus.

(i) A supposes that Jacob was 84 when married (xlvii.9,comp. xli.46,xlv.6); B that he was 64.

(ii) A requires us to believe that in the space of 7 years, Jacob had 7 children by Leah (besides 4 by the handmaids, and one by Rachel), yet none of them twins, and with a considerable lapse of time between the 4th and 5th (xxix.35); just possible, perhaps, but surely most improbable; B allows for the same events 27 years.

(iii) A would make Joseph but 6 years younger than Reuben, yet is he spoken of as the son of Jacob's 'old age' (xxxvii.3), and constantly as one much younger than the others; B would make him 26 years younger than Reuben, and probably 15-6 younger than any of the others.

If this be so, then Judah must have been 40 years old at the time of Joseph's sale into Egypt, and the second argument in p.3, note, falls to the ground. The case of Hezron and Hamul remains, however, just the same; they must have been born in Egypt. For the difficulty lies not in Judah's having grandchildren at 42, as some seem to imagine, but in these two particular grandchildren being born, under the circumstances narrated in Gen.xxxviii., within the 22 years from Joseph's sale to Jacob's descent into Egypt; which remains precisely the same, whether Judah were 20 or 40 at the time of his first marriage.

2. GEN.XLVI.

Throughout the whole of chap.i., Gen.xlvi. is spoken of as the work of *Moses*; the evidence considered in the present volume has led us to regard it rather as part of the pre-mosaic collection of Annals, on which Moses based his history. Some such general expression as 'the writer' &c., should therefore be substituted.

3. THE FOURTH GENERATION.

In p.15-6 the number of generations during the sojourn in Egypt is admitted to be *four*, according to Bishop Colenso's representation. Further consideration of the lists on which that representation is based, have led us to regard this as erroneous. Some indeed of the people, as for instance Eleazar, Gershom, the

sons of Michael, of Korah, of Dathan, were certainly in the fourth generation from Jacob's sons; others, however, were in the fifth, *e.g.* Nahshon, and Zelophehad; one in the sixth, Bezaleel; one also in the tenth, Joshua. This last was spoken of in p.14, note, indeed, as probably a mistake of the Chronicler; we are disposed now to retract that opinion. The only reason against the accuracy of this genealogy (1Chron.vii.23-7), is the fact of Joshua's grandfather, Elishama, being prince of the tribe of Ephraim (Nu.i,10), at the same time that his grandson was general of the army. But we have the same apparent anomaly in the case of Hur and Bezaleel (Ex.xxxi.2), which is unobjected to. Suppose Elishama the contemporary of Moses and Aaron, and therefore between 80-90, and Joshua a shade younger than Caleb, or between 30-40, and the whole is clear and reasonable. Moreover we read that 'Joseph saw Ephraim's children of the third generation' (Gen.l.23), that is the fourth from himself. But if there had been 4 generations within 80 years, there certainly might be 6 more in 110-20. The obscurity of the previous account of Ephraim's children, 1Chron.vii.20-2, in no way affects the genealogy of Joshua. This being so, it would certainly be fairer to reckon the average number of generations in Egypt as *five* rather than four.

The following errors (corrected in 3rd edition) arising partly from inadvertence, partly from printer's mistakes, may also be pointed out as of some importance.

p.10, for '12-3 years afterwards' (twice), read 'many years afterwards'.

p.12, for 'two distinct families, the Hezronites' &c., read 'three distinct families, the Pharzites, the Hezronites' &c.

p.36, 'Ephah and Maacah' enumerated as concubines of Caleb the son of Hezron, belonged not to him, but to the later Caleb, the son of Jephunneh.

p.114-5, for '8-900' (twice), read '8-9000'.

pp.129-30,136, for '3600' (three times), read '3500'.

p.153, for '30 or 40', read '50'.

APPENDIX No. III.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON SOME POINTS OF INTEREST.

SOME matters touched upon by Bishop Colenso in Parts II. and III. have been passed over, or only just alluded to, in the text, as being irrelevant to the proper subject before us. Briefly to consider these is the object of this Appendix.

1. MOUNT MORIAH.

That there is no reason for supposing the hill of Abraham's sacrifice to be the same with that on which the Temple was built, but rather the contrary, we have already admitted (p.51, note). Bishop Colenso, however, would have us believe, that the Temple was never built on Mount Moriah at all, but on Mount Zion. His reason for this is the fact, that the place of God's dwelling is always spoken of by the prophets, psalmists, &c., as Zion, never as Moriah, whether they lived before or after the captivity. This is certainly the case; yet is the statement in 2Chron.iii.1 very explicit, that it was upon Mount Moriah that the Temple was built. Nor is this testimony weakened materially by the late date at which the Chronicler wrote; since he had the second Temple before his eyes, which was doubtless built upon the same site as the first, being reared by those who had seen the first (Ezra,iii.12); while, as already remarked, the use of the name Zion is quite as marked and universal after the captivity, even to the days of the Maccabees, as before. That these two appellations involve a contradiction is, therefore, most improbable. Bishop Colenso's own explanation of the distinction between the city of Zion, and the Temple-hill, makes the whole clear at once. David was in the city of Zion at the time of the pestilence, on the adjoining eminence stood the threshing-floor of Araunah, where Jehovah appeared to him. This spot he selected for the site of the Temple, and thither we read that Solomon brought up the ark 'out of the city of David, which is Zion' (1Kings,viii.1).

This eminence the Chronicler tells us was called 'Moriah', without however laying any stress upon the name, or implying any connection between it and the 'appearing' unto David. The city of Zion seems then to have spread itself out beyond its former boundaries, and covered this hill also. Nothing was hence more natural, than that the whole mountain should receive the name which had at first belonged only to a part; and so the dwelling-place of Jehovah be still spoken of as Mount Zion, as in fact we find it.

2. THE TABERNACLE AT GIBEON.

Both Kings and Chronicles agree that the 'great high-place' was at Gibeon, that there Solomon sacrificed 1000 burnt-offerings, and that there Jehovah appeared to him in a dream. When however the Chronicler goes further, and tells us the reason for this, that there stood the Tabernacle and the brazen altar, Bishop Colenso rejects his statements as untrustworthy and fictitious. His reasons for this are, (1) the absence of any mention of the Tabernacle in Kings; (2) the divided worship resulting from the ark being in one place, and the altar in another; (3) the silence of the history as to the various removals of the Tabernacle; and (4) the fact of Samuel not committing the ark to the Tabernacle, on its recovery from the Philistines, but to a private house; and of David building a special Tabernacle for the ark at Zion; neither of which were probable if the original Mosaic tent yet stood. To this we may reply, (1) that the separation of the ark from the Tabernacle, and the worship before it, were time-honoured customs, however contrary to the original design of Moses (see p.310), and we have here to do simply with matters of *fact*, not of *right*; (2) that it is certain the Tabernacle *was* removed from Shiloh, stood for a time at Nob, and afterwards ceased to be there, from the statements of the earlier history (1Sam.i.-iv.xxi.-ii.); (3) that the ark was committed to the house of Abinadab by the men of Kirjath-jearim, not by Samuel, who does not appear as Israel's judge until 20 years later (1Sam.vii. 1-3). There seems, therefore, no sufficient ground for doubting the Chronicler's statement that the Tabernacle did stand at that season at Gibeon.

3. THE MORALITY OF CERTAIN LAWS.

The Mosaic legislation, as already remarked (p.328-9), contained laws of very various kinds, and of different degrees of authority; some of its enactments were world-wide and eternal, the basis of all sound Morality and true Religion; others had reference to

the special circumstances and necessities of the time, and cannot be applied to any other time without injustice. The law of Moses commanded that witches and wizards should be put to death (Lev.xx.27), because these were certain to lead men into idolatry, which was an act of rebellion against Israel's king; they were guilty, in fact, of high treason. To apply such a law to modern spirit-rappers or astrologers, would manifestly be to ignore its spirit and intention altogether. The law of Moses required a man to raise up seed to his brother, in case he died childless, by marrying his wife; a regulation necessitated by the peculiar laws of inheritance then in force. Those laws have given place to others, and marriage with a deceased brother's wife ceases to be obligatory. These two principles are of the highest importance for the right understanding of the Mosaic legislation; —The law was given to a people who stood in a peculiar and unparalleled relation to God; the law was suited to a barbarous and uncivilized time. Only in its connection with that people and that time, then, can its special enactments be rightly understood. Let us now apply these principles to the instances of unjust or immoral laws, especially insisted upon by Bishop Colenso.

1. The laws concerning the destruction of the Canaanites, and the conquest of the rest of the promised land, are objected to as cruel and horrible.

The lives and possessions of all men belong to God, and he may dispose of them justly as he wills. 'Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?' It was God's will that the wicked nations of Canaan should be destroyed, and that in due time all the surrounding country, even to the Euphrates, should be subjected to his chosen people. But he would make the possession of this land by Israel conditional upon obedience. Instead therefore of destroying the nations before them by any immediate act of judgment, as he might have done, he committed it to the Israelites. If they obeyed his commands the land was theirs; if they disobeyed, then these unsmitten nations should be their curse. And so the history tells us it fell out; so far as the Israelites carried out the injunction utterly to destroy the Canaanites, so far they were blessed; they failed to do so thoroughly, and the spared remnant became thorns in their eyes and pricks in their sides, even as it had been predicted. With respect to the more distant nations, hereafter to be subjugated, the case was somewhat different. Here Israel had no commission to destroy, but to subdue; only when submission was refused were extreme measures to be resorted to. God gave these

nations to be Israel's servants; they refused; then were they resisting God, and as God's soldiers Israel smote them. In both cases the people acted simply under orders, and were no more responsible for the slaughter they occasioned, than are the soldiers of an army for the death of every foe they slay, while obeying the explicit commands of king and general. By two hypotheses only can cruelty be justly charged upon these commands, either (1) that they did not originate with God, as the history declares; or (2) that God had no right thus to punish or dispose of his creatures. The first of these is negatived at once by the many proofs of the authenticity and genuineness of the whole story, considered in this and the preceding volumes; the second, who will dare to assert? Nor is it to be overlooked, that similar instances occur in later history. Wherefore was Saul rejected from the kingdom? Because he obeyed not Jehovah. And wherein disobeyed he? In that he destroyed not utterly the sinners the Amalekites. To draw from such particular commands, and the obligation to obedience which they involved, any general principle of *warfare*, is to mistake their spirit altogether; their lesson is *obedience*. Let first, then, the divine command be given us, thus to act, and then will be the time to follow their example.

2. The law which provided that 'stubborn and rebellious' children should be stoned to death, is objected to as unjust, since in most cases this would be the parents' fault, in not training them aright.

Retribution for sin is the principle of the Mosaic penal code, no excuse or justification could therefore be admitted. Granted that a wicked son had been ill trained, did this make his breach of the 5th commandment less a sin? should it go unpunished because evil influence had been its cause? On this principle nearly every sin must be passed over;—might not his parents be vicious from ill-training, as well as he, and their parents in the same way?—and so no one be punished at all. 'The soul that sinneth it shall die', no matter what the occasion of its sin. But at least, then, it may be said, the guilty parents should be punished also. We answer, that the Law was not intended for cases where the parents had either connived at or occasioned the children's sin. It was expressly for *disobedient* children, who had been 'chastened', but would 'not hearken' (Deut.xxi.18). This word 'chasten' (יָסַר) is used in Deuteronomy to express Jehovah's dealings with the people in the wilderness (viii.5), as also of his 'instructing' them in the Law (iv.36); implies, therefore undoubtedly, that the misconduct of

the son was contrary to the training he had received. Were the case otherwise, and the accusation of the parents vindictive or false, then the law of false witness would come in, and themselves be condemned instead of their son (xix.16-21).

3. The law which excluded persons having certain deformities from the congregation, also bastards to the tenth generation, is objected to as unjust, as taking no account of those through whom these hindrances had come.

A great principle was here involved, that none unclean might enter the congregation. The exclusion was certainly no more unjust, than that of lepers, or those defiled with issues, &c. Only in this case the uncleanness being permanent, the exclusion was for life; or, where it affected the blood of descent, for many lives. The parents of a bastard were not passed over, but were both commanded to be *stoned* (Lev.xviii.,xx.10-16). It was not therefore a case of children being punished instead of their parents, but merely of children suffering through their parents' sin, which is one of God's avowed principles of action (Ex.xx.5, xxxiv.7), and of which instances may be seen around us every day. Is God's providence, then, unjust?

The other objections made to the morality of the laws are comparatively trifling, and are sufficiently set at rest by the general remarks above. (See also Hist. Charact. Pent. Appen. No.II. and III.)

4. Deut.xxvii.1-8.

This passage, together with xi.30, is inserted, with some notable variations, by the Samaritan Pentateuch between Ex.xx.17and18. Kennicott argues that it was part of the original text, omitted by the Jews on account of the honour done in it to Mount Gerizzim.* With this Bishop Colenso agrees, adding further, that the other variations are due to the Deuteronomist, who copied the passage from Exodus. On this we may remark as follows.

(i) The mere fact of Gerizzim being mentioned here would be no reason for the Jews to have omitted the whole passage. The same motive should have led them to omit Deut.xxvii.1-8 also. But if they were content to alter the name to Ebal there (as is supposed), why should they have desired to do more here?

(ii) There was at least as much likelihood of the Samaritans altering Ebal to Gerizzim, as of the Jews doing the reverse.

---

* In Deut.xxvii.4, the Heb.Mss.,LXX., and all other versions, read 'Ebal', the Sam. Pent. 'Gerizzim'. Kennicott regards the latter as the original reading.

(iii) The external evidence is very strongly against the Samaritan insertion in Exodus. One Syrian MS., Kennicott notes, leaves a space just large enough for the passage; but otherwise every MS. and Vers. supports the Hebrew; even the LXX., which oftenest agrees with the Samaritan.

(iv) The passage reads very strangely after the Ten Commandments; is it God, who is still speaking to the people in voice of thunder, who makes these provisions about the engraving of the stones? Surely not; yet is this the only construction which our present *v.*17,18, would allow.

(v) The phraseology reminds one strongly of Deuteronomy, and especially the phrase, 'which I command thee this day' Deut.iv.40,vi.6,vii.11,viii.1,x.13,xi.8,13,28,xiii.18,xv.5,15,xix.9, xxvii.1,10,xxviii.1,15,xxx.8, &c., once only besides in the Pentateuch Ex.xxxiv.11).

(vi) It seems more likely that a later scribe should have strung together two passages in Deuteronomy (xxvii.1-8, and xi.30), than that the author of Deuteronomy should have split up the original statement. The variations are as difficult to account for on one hypothesis as the other; while the reference to Ex.xx. 24-5, in Deut.xxvii.5-7 may probably account for its insertion there.

(vii) The difficulty supposed to be removed by this emendation (viz., what law it was which was to be engraved upon the stones), is really no difficulty at all. The phrase employed, '*words* of this law' (see p.223-5), coupled with the fact of their being to be engraved on stones, would sufficiently determine it to be the ten commandments and nothing else (comp. also Josh. viii.32).

We conclude, therefore, that the Hebrew text is, on every ground, to be preferred.

In 1Kings, besides the references to the law of Moses, and the quotation from Deuteronomy, already considered (p.319), we have mention of the covenant at the Exodus (viii.21), the promises made by Moses, and their fulfilment (*v.*56). The testimony of 2Kings is chiefly to the law, and has been discussed before (p.318-9).

Here certainly is a very large amount of confirmatory evidence, almost all incidental too, showing that the facts referred to were familiar to the writers. History, however, presents but few opportunities for such allusions compared with poetry; let us turn then to the testimony of the Psalms, commencing with those ascribed to David, or contemporaneous with him. Ps.lxviii. contains many references to the wilderness-sojourn, besides quotations from the Pentateuch and book of Judges (see pp.83,88-9). Ps.lxxviii. is a complete epitomy of the previous history of Israel, the plagues of Egypt in full detail, the passage of the Red Sea, the cloudy and fiery pillars, the manna, the water from the rock, their rebellion and murmurings, the quails and subsequent plague, the long sojourn in the wilderness, the conquest of Canaan, the division of the land, their relapse into idolatry, and deliverance under David; abounding throughout with verbal parallelisms to the Pentateuch. Ps.lxxx. contains an allusion to the order of marching (*v.*2, comp.Nu.x.22-4), and the Exodus generally. So also Ps.lxxxi. with special mention of the burdens of Egypt, the waters of Meribah, and the law of the new-moons. In Ps.ciii.7 is reference to God's revelation of himself to Moses; in cx.4 to the priesthood of Melchizedec; in cxxxiii.2 to the anointing of Aaron. Besides these we have, of later Psalms, lxxvii. which makes mention of Moses and Aaron leading the people (*v.*20); xcix. which speaks of them as priests (*v.*6); cv.-vi. (written just after the restoration from Babylon) which contain an even fuller summary of their history than lxxviii., beginning with the covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob concerning the land of Canaan, their wanderings and God's protection of them, the famine in Egypt, the sale, imprisonment, and exaltation of Joseph; then going on to the descent of Jacob thither, the increase of the people, the subtle cruelty of their oppressors, the mission of Moses and Aaron, the plagues in fullest detail, the riches acquired at the Exodus, the cloudy and fiery pillars, the passage of the Red Sea and destruction of their enemies, their song of praise thereon, the manna, quails, and miraculous supply of water, the golden calf, the plagues at Taberah and Kibroth-hattaavah, the murmuring at Kadesh, with the intercession of Moses, and the sentence pronounced upon them, the destruction

of Dathan and Abiram, the giving of water at Kadesh, with Moses' sin, the sin concerning Baal-Peor, with Phinehas' act of vengeance and its blessing, the conquest of Canaan, their disobedience, rebellion, punishment, and ultimate captivity. Also Ps.cxiv., with its allusion to the passage of the Red Sea, and of Jordan; cxxxv. with its references to the death of the first-born, and conquest of Sihon and Og; repeated again in cxxxvi. with further mention of the Red Sea and Pharaoh's overthrow; besides the designation of the Priests as 'the house of Aaron' in cxv.10,12,cxviii.3,cxxxv.19.

Among the Prophets, Isaiah alludes twice to the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (i.9,xiii.19), also to the oppression in Egypt and passage of the Red Sea (x.24-6), the call of Abraham (xxix.22), besides several references to the histories of Joshua and Judges. In the latter half of his prophecy (by many ascribed to another author), we have mention of Abraham and Sarah (li.2), the passage of the Red Sea (li.10), the sojourn and oppression in Egypt (lii.4), the garden of Eden (li.3), the covenant with Noah (liv.9), again the passage of the Red Sea, with prominent mention of Moses (lxiii.11-4). Jeremiah abounds with allusions to the Pentateuch, and quotations from its pages, as is admitted, and has been shewn above (p.192-3). Ezekiel also is very full of such. To produce instances from these, however, is unnecessary; since it is allowed that by this time, at all events, the Pentateuch was known and received. Among the earlier prophets, we must not overlook Hosea's references to the Exodus (ii.15,xi.1,xiii.4), to the sin with Baal-Peor (ix.10), the circumstances attendant on the birth of Jacob (xii.3), his struggle with the angel, and vision at Bethel (xii.4), his serving for a wife in Syria (xii.12), the feast of tabernacles as connected with Egypt (xii.9), and their deliverance thence by a prophet (xii.13); besides two pointed allusions to the war between Benjamin and Israel at Gibeah (ix.9,x.9). Amos makes mention of the 40 years wilderness-sojourn, and destruction of the gigantic Amorites (ii.9-10,v.25), the Exodus (ii.10,iii.1,ix.7), the pestilence of Egypt (iv.10). Micah, too, speaks of the Exodus, and of Moses, Aaron, and Miriam as its leaders (vi.4), of Balak and Balaam (vi.5), of the signs wrought at the Exodus (vii.15), and of the covenant with Abraham (vii.20).

With such evidence before us, we cannot doubt but that the facts recorded in the Pentateuch were both known and believed by all the great leaders and writers in Israel, from the time of Joshua to the captivity, and most surely ever since.